

5

A
DEFENCE.
OF THE
PROPOSITION:

OR,

Some REASONS rendred why the
Nonconformist-Minister who comes to his Pa-
rish-Church and Common-Prayer, cannot
yet yeeld to other things that are enjoyned,
without some Moderation.

BEING

A Full REPLY to the Book which
is a pretended ANSWER thereunto.

By the same Author.

*Nova & inaudita est ista prædicatio quæ verberibus exigit
fidem. Gregory.*

London, Printed in the Year, 1668.

DEFENCE

PROSECUTION

STATE OF NEW YORK

IN SENATE

JANUARY 18, 1890

REPORT

OF THE

COMMISSIONERS

OF THE LAND OFFICE

IN RESPONSE TO A RESOLUTION

PASSED BY THE SENATE

APRIL 18, 1889

ALBANY:

WATKINS, PUBLISHER.

The Defence of the Proposition.

I Received a Book which hath the Title of an Answer to my *Proposition*, I read it over twice or thrice, and considering what seemed to me more material to be answered, I wrote near a sheet about it, and sent it to the Printer, who being upon a second Edition, might as I thought stay for it. I have now set me down again, and seeing I know not by some expressions, but the Author may be a considerable person, either a Bishop when he speaks of others, as the *small Levites*, or a retainer to the Bishops, in some power, when he seems so well to know their minds, and requires to have ours, I am willing to look the Book over again with more deliberation.

There are I account, as it were two parts of the Book ; The one concerns me, and the other follows the Theme he hath proposed, *The Inconveniencies of Toleration*. That which concerns his Theme does, as I judge, shew the Author to be a bitter and intelligent person : but whether there be more subtilty, or bitterness, I judge not. That which concerns me I am now to give some fuller account of, in the ensuing Papers. For if there be but any coal of hope that some good may be done, I am loth for want of blowing, as it lies upon my hands, it should go out.

The first Paragraph of this Author's Book looks handsomely, and like the same piece at the end. But I think that wins him nothing more than a fairer reception of what he has to say. It is true, Liberty of Conscience is a thing that doth often prove very unmanageable ; it is a beast of a

**IRREC
PAGIN**

REGULAR INATION

[8]

er to
and
o be
o the
as I
and
thor
he
the
ow
to
TO
ok ;
me
hat
Au-
her
hat
unt
of
of

id-
think that
of what he
a thing that
geable; it is a beast of a
A ; beautiful

DEFENCE

PROSECUTION

Some of the evidence which

is given in the case of

the case of the

case of the

case of the

case of the

case of the

case of the

case of the

The Defence of the Proposition.

I Received a Book which hath the Title of an Answer to my *Proposition*, I read it over twice or thrice, and considering what seemed to me more material to be answered, I wrote near a sheet about it, and sent it to the Printer, who being upon a second Edition, might as I thought stay for it. I have now set me down again, and seeing I know not by some expressions, but the Author may be a considerable person, either a Bishop when he speaks of others, as the *small Levites*, or a retainer to the Bishops, in some power, when he seems so well to know their minds, and requires to have ours, I am willing to look the Book over again with more deliberation.

There are I account, as it were two parts of the Book ; The one concerns me, and the other follows the Theme he hath proposed, *The Inconveniencies of Toleration*. That which concerns his Theme does, as I judge, shew the Author to be a bitter and intelligent person : but whether there be more subtilty, or bitterness, I judge not. That which concerns me I am now to give some fuller account of, in the ensuing Papers. For if there be but any coal of hope that some good may be done, I am loth for want of blowing, as it lies upon my hands, it should go out.

The first Paragraph of this Author's Book looks handsomely, and like the same piece at the end. But I think that wins him nothing more than a fairer reception of what he has to say. It is true, Liberty of Conscience is a thing that doth often prove very unmanageable ; it is a beast of a

beautiful feature, but apt to be wild by nature : yet is there a difference between those who are in the saddle ; Let our true *Alexander* but take this wild thing by the bridle, and turn it to the Sun (the beams of his favour) and he shall do more to tame, and make it serviceable by gentleness, than all the skill which hath been used hitherto, hath done by force. As for the rest which he doth *promise*, it is as I suppose what is obvious, and said commonly, and I have spoken (I think) enough to it, in the Paper I sent away. That which is wanting there, is the consideration of the state of my *Proposition*, which this Antagonist of mine is not willing to understand. There are two parts it consists of in my Book ; An *Accommodation* with the Sober in their Principles, and *Indulgence* toward others. By the Sober I understand all that are of that latitude, whether *Presbyterian* or *Independant*, as can come into the Ministry, or joyn in the Common Service, upon such terms as the King's Declaration heretofore concerning Ecclesiastical Affairs, if it were made a Law, would afford. By an Accommodation, I would understand the same thing as that Gentleman who seconded me in this motion so confidently, doth call an *Established Order*. This should be of no less latitude than to comprehend all such ; and all such should be for hereafter as true Sons of the Church, as any he that is now a Bishop or a Dean. And this should be our Uniformity. As for those which cannot come into this Order, supposing it so comprehensively established, it is they alone should be the Nonconformists, and I would have *Indulgence* for them as a means, which is the likest (if others were so united) in my apprehension, to break them by little and little, and at last reduce them to us. My Reasons for this are in my Book. And hence is it that this Au-
thor

thor accounts me in his thoughts, *divided in my points*, (pag. 27.) whereas they both are but the two parts of my Proposition. Here you may see in the result, how our Accommodation is not a thing *universal and unlimited*, and yet *Conscience*, as a kind of thing that is *sacred*, be inviolate.

THe first thing which I shall observe in this Treatise, which pretends to so much Peace, Good Will and Moderation, is the Time of its coming out, and that was the Time of an Invasion: Was this a Time to rip up and aggravate Discontents at home, when we were set upon with a Powerful Enemy from abroad? Who but a Dutch-man would have gone about to have affrighted the credulous Vulgar with this Canting Dismal Strain? Pag. 86. There are I perceive many Fears and Hopes upon the Minds of People, and the Presages of their Hearts are many: I know not whether there be any dark notices from some Spirits that preside over us, of some great Events, sometimes when they are near us: But methinks the Minds of some have of late aboarded some very Great Evil or Great Good not to be far from us, &c. He who at such a time Proclaims the Fears of the Nation, Intended sure to make them fear much more: This way of divulging such Melancholy Omens, could have no end, but to dishearten our People, or to inflame them. I could not, methoughts, pass by this Observation; because it was one sad Instance, That the Puritan Spirit hath not at all altered his old way of Acting; For so did their Forefathers in 88 try how far they could terrifie the State at that time, because it was a Time of great Danger. England at this Time did labour not only with a War Abroad, but with Schism at Home: For Schismatical Pravity never fails to add a New Combustion to the Heat of War; The Contumacy, Impudence, and Contumelies of these Men did never shew it self with greater Insolence. Cambr. Eliz. pag. 497. in Editione Lond. MDC XV. They presumed upon the necessities of the State; then they thought they might propose and rail at pleasure, because the Queens hands were sufficiently full of other business; Then came out Mar-Prelate, Diotrephes, the Demonstration, &c. Thus they use their Native Country as Simeon and Levi did the Shichemites, as soon as they were sore, then not fail to fall upon them. If ever the State lies under a Disadvantage, These will not fail to help on the Disturbance.

The

The Proeme being over, That Prejudice guides this man you may see by his entrance upon me for the Time my Book was sent to the Press. Any honest man might think, that if they would have been never so much offended with me for writing upon this subject another time, it might be an excuse sufficient for any man, when the *Dutch* were in our Harbours, and the Enemy to appearance, ripe for Invasion, to put forth the uttermost of his endeavours for uniting of all our hearts to the King, and one another; that the Kingdom might not be lost through our Divisions. I must confess there were some Papers I wrote upon the *Oxford Oath*, the design whereof in the whole was to do my best on both sides for the perswading my Brethren to Submission, and Rulers to Indulgence and Accommodation. Now the occasion of the *Dutch* presenting it self, I did according to my excuse mentioned, send abroad the last sheet of those Papers, enlarging it into four as it is, supposing it to be seasonable: and as for the other 14 or 15 sheets that are left, I think they do directly tend to the service of his Majesty, and may therefore come abroad in season (if some please) though the subject of them otherwise, will I hope be out of date. Now that *Dismal Canting Strain* of those words he mentions of mine (with such a phrasing of it) was the dictate of my Pen and Heart at that time, which was the Spring before the dreadful Calamity on the City, and what followed: which I set down truly, not so much to shew meerly that here indeed was no *Canting*, but that there is neither the spirit nor reason of the thing he imagines; as also that through the Ministry of Spirits it is probable (as I there hint) that some dark impressions are infixed some times on mortal minds as to things to come. As for that generous Title of *Puritan*, which

which he hath dub'd me with, I must confess it pleases me, but I cannot receive the honour from him, without acknowledgement, that I doubt me, I am not really good enough for it, but something more like rather such another formal man as he himself; onely I (as my Conscience to me is witness) a server of my *Countrey*, and he a server of the *Time*.

But from the time of the Publication, proceed we to the Book it self; The first thing we find observable is p. 9, 10, 11. There is a compny of People about Us in the Countrey, &c. The most of them are certainly Inoffensive Persons, and there is no more against Them, than Pliny had against the Christians; that They meet and Preach and Pray together, &c. How harmless, or Inoffensive They may seem to You, we know not: But this, nor our Neighbour Nation, hath not found them to be such Tame and Modest things: The time hath been known, when they could devour Widows houses, as well as for a pretence make long Prayers. Our Charity prompts us to hope, that there are amongst this Sect several good and well-meaning People, and such which of themselves would be very harmless and inoffensive; yet, Law-makers ought to consider not only what People are, or would be of themselves, but what use others are like to make of them: It is no news for men to be made the Instruments of a Design. and yet to know nothing of it; to be the great Engines of such businesses, which had they seen through them, they would have died, rather than to have anything to do with: We are therefore not onely to consider the People who meet there, but who they are which have the managing of such Meetings; as suppose now that the separated Congregations should think those men the fittest to be their Guides, who led them on to the late War; That the chief Speakers there should be the Abettors and Applauders of the murder of the King. And these amongst them who are of their own Nature the most harmless and inoffensive, are the most likely there to be imposed upon: It is therefore the greatest kindness of Government toward such innocent men, not to permit the subtile and malicious, to make a prey of them, and abuse their Credulity to be the Instrument of their Teachers contrivances. And whereas it is here

said, that they meet only to Preach and Pray together : It ought to be considered that we could repeat strange things, which have been said in Prayers and Sermons ; neither are we sure that they meet only to do that : we know, that there may be, and do verily believe, that there is a quite other use of such Assemblies, viz. " To form and to know
 " a Party, to communicate intelligence and discontents, to have a plausible and unperceivable way of scattering abroad among the whole Nation, all sorts of little and malicious stories. There is no such dangerous way of libelling, as that which is vulgarly called a good Gift in Prayer.

It is the apprehension of this Reverend Person, that though the generality of the people that flock to Conventicles are innocent men, yet the Preachers may have their designs of Sedition, and meet for something else then to Preach and Pray together. I am fully perswaded, as to the main, he is mistaken. The most of them do it seriously, and out of Conscience ; and those that do not, if I speak, as I indeed believe, the thing is no other in earnest, but, in the Grave and more cunning, a livelyhood ; in the younger and more giddy, vain-glory. And as for our Rulers then, let them but provide an accomodation to bring the Consciences off, and the others, either like forced things will not hold long together, or if they do, these are ends shall never commend those that serve them, but will do the State no hurt.

The next thing observable is p. 13. I wonder really in whose shops they have bought their Spectacles, that they can see this great thing Unity of Folks Spirits, in Uniformity, &c. Surely Uniformity doth of all things in the world look most like to Unity ; And St. Paul recommends it to us upon this very score ; That we all speak the same things, being with him a very great evidence, That there are no divisions amongst us. But because the credit of these Glasses wherein we perswade our selves, That we see clearly Unity in Uniformity

mity, doth it seems depend very much upon the Shop they came out of. We shall gratifie our Author so far, as to let him know whence we haue them; and to go no further, we are advised, in the making and using of this sort of Glasses, by one, who we are sure, will not be denyed to be a most skilful workman in such like affairs; even the Non-conformists entirely beloved Mr. Calvin, in his Epist. ad Protectorem Angliz, where we have him expressing his judgement clearly and fully for Uniformity in all its parts, and utmost extent of it. "It is fit (saith he) to take great heed of the desultory wits, i. e. The light giddy-headed people, who desire for themselves too boundless a liberty; the Gate is to be shut against curions, i. e. new fangled Doctrines. But how is this, think you, to be done? by liberty of Conscience? No, but by a more sober way. "And for this, there is but one ready and assured way: If there be some one form of Doctrine received of all, which in their Preaching all should follow, to which also all the Bishops and Parish Priests should by Oath be bound; and that no man should be admitted to any Ecclesiastical Benefice, unless he promised that that consent of Doctrine should be to him inviolable. Here we have him clear and express, full and home for Uniformity so far as Doctrine reacheth. But secondly, He is as clear for Uniformity in Prayers, and the Rites and Ceremonies thereof. "As to the Form of Prayers, and Rites Ecclesiastical, I do very much approve, that there be one certain One, partly to provide against the simplicity and idleness of some, and partly to demonstrate the agreement of our Churches between themselves, and lastly to provide against the desultory Levity of those men who are alwayes affecting novelities. The second of these Reasons comes home to what our Author makes such a wonder of, viz. That Uniformity is a great degree and evidence of our Unity: And we are told a little before in the same Epistle, that there are a sort of seditious People in England, which all Authority is highly concerned to provide against, and he describes them thus. "There are (saith he) some brain-sick People in England, who under the pretence of the Gospel, bring in all sorts of disorder. And his sentence is very peremptory concerning them; "That they ought to be restrained by the avenging Sword. Now who these People are, who are complained of, as the destroyers of all order, is not surely hard to be conceived: They are the destroyers of all order, who refuse to be under any, who will own the obligation of no Law (as to these Externals wherein order

alone can have any place) but take it very ill, that they are not left wholly and altogether to their own Humour and Capriciousness, or what ever else it is possible for them to mistake for, or to pretend to be their Conscience. And now if we think that Uniformity looks like Unity, we hope the Glasses which we see this through, will be no longer derided, when we consider in whose shops we found them exposed to our open view, and we our selves were particularly called upon by the chief Artificer, to make use of them for this very particular purpose and occasion. But that Uniformity is a thing highly to be desired, and by all possible means to be endeavoured after and procured, is a thing which I suppose will not be denied by that Party which is here chiefly pleaded for. Because that they have with hands lifted up to heaven, sworn themselves, and not only so, but with all manner of art and violence, did perswade and force every one they had interest in, or power over, to swear with them, That they would endeavour to bring the Churches of God in the three Kingdoms, to the nearest Conjunction and UNIFORMITY in Religion, Confession of Faith, Form of Church-Government, Directory for Worship and Catechising. See the first Article of the Covenant. We have one Argument more for Uniformity, and that is, The horrible Divisions which we have seen to arise for the want of it; and here we appeal to the sober part of our Adversaries, who when time was, made great complaints of this very thing; the sight of the hideous Heresies, Schisms and Scandals, which did immediately arise among themselves, did make them cry out mightily to their Rulers for a Law, to set bounds to the Consciences of their own Brethren. Liberty of Conscience is so wild a Spirit, as no Circle will keep in order: and to speak the truth, it is a contradiction to own that pretence, and then to offer to set any bounds unto it. But to draw towards a conclusion of this Argument, we do verily believe, that Uniformity, if it were carefully maintained, and diligently looked after, would in a few years recal our antient Unity; the people would quickly forget all these fantasies, if it were not for the small Levites which are perpetually buzzing them into their ears; We should quickly see, that the people would come to the Churches, if there were not so many Conventicles to keep them thence; and if they were but used for a little while to come thither, they would not find the Liturgy to be such a fearful Idol, as they have been often told of: And I durst confidently say, That if a tryal were made in any gathered Church about the
Town,

Town, and many of our Prayers were there repeated memoriter, that that man would be accounted one of great Gifts that could pray so sweetly: It is nothing but unacquaintedness which makes them lyable to be so scared, with all those terrible and groundless stories. And I here durst boldly appeal to thousands, who have since the Kings return, gone once or twice to hear the Common-Prayer out of curiosity, and have gone ever after out of Conscience; and have much wondered at and despised their own credulity, in that they were ever brought to entertain such hard jealousies of so harmless a thing.

I am beholding to this learned Gentleman, I thank him for his pains in the Authority he hath quoted. I must confess I expected something out of *Tacitus*, or *Machiavel*, or such a one as *Bodin* or *Henningus Arniseus*, but when he brings me *Mr. John Calvin*, I must needs say I should have accepted, if he had pleased, as well of *Mr. Richard Hooker*, and something the rather in this, being a person apter for Politicks, and in whom we shall have a milder spirit. But will he stand to learned *Calvin's* judgment? Does he think if our Act of Uniformity were sent over to *Geneva* they would write so to the Parliament, (or he, if he were alive) in our case now, as he did then to the Protector? If he indeed thinks otherwise, then is the man here conceitedly wise, but sayes nothing. As to the matter, There is *Uniformity*, and *this Uniformity*. This distinction is manifest by what he brings out of the Covenant, wherein they sware they would endeavour to bring the Churches to the nearest Uniformity. Now as this Uniformity of the Covenant was so far from being the means of Union, as to them, that it was the Bar which kept them from Union: So is the Uniformity which this Gentleman pleads for at this time, so far from being the means of Union with others, and so far is that from Truth, that our Divisions have
arose

arise for the want hereof, that this same Act of Uniformity as now it is enjoyned, is the *Partition-Wall* between the *Conformist* and *Non-conformist*, that till that be down there can be no reconciliation in this Land. The *Papists* have their Uniformity; will the *Protestant* say here that Uniformity, or the *Trent-Council*, is the means to Unity? If it be between themselves, we know it shall everlastingly hinder all Union between us and them. But why I pray doth he not take the whole sentence; and when he doth assume against me that *Uniformity is the means to Unity*, (for so he sayes expressly, if it were carefully maintained it would be) why doth he not prove too, that *old Foundations are established by new Impositions*? And if he would do that, I will tell him the way. Let us have a new moulded order or frame of Uniformity that will take in all that are sober Protestants under it, & this shall be no doubt a means of Unity amongst our selves: Provided when we have done so, we do not yet go about to persecute any others that cannot come in and yeeld to it. For when nothing will make a party stand out besides, this will most effectually do it, and increase their numbers continually. It makes them considerable if we trouble our selves with them; but if we let them alone, we render them despicable, and by making, we shall make nothing of them.

But we are told in the next place, That to make Laws in Religious Matters especially, (and by the same Rule in every thing else) is a thing, to say no more, perfectly insignificant, and absolutely useless; For, It is a Principle of a serious tender Christian, that he would not do any thing for fear, which he would not out of Conscience, i. e. As these words must signifie in this place, he will do no more for the sake of the Law, than he would have done without it: And it is a deadly Temptation against the present Injunctions, that they have

have a penalty annexed to them. Did ever any hear of a Law without a Penalty? was ever an Injunction drawn up in this form? These things we do enjoin you to do; and if you do them, it shall be to you the same thing as if you let them alone. If the Church hath power to command us anything, we need go no farther than common sense to infer; That she hath power to punish, if that be not done which is commanded: and now that the Church hath power to make Injunctions of this nature; We have evidence enough from the Scripture it self, where we find our Saviour so far owning this Authority, as that he submitted to it: The Feast of the Dedication was of Institution purely humane, and yet our Lord observed it; John 10. 22. Nay farther, our Saviour did not only observe humane Institutions, where there was no particular command in Scripture for them; but he also did observe such as were in outward circumstances, quite different from what the Scripture hath appointed them to be in. If this seem strange to us, let us look into Exod. 12. 11. where we find the very manner of eating the Passover plainly prescribed to us, to be done in a standing posture, and that with all the punctual formality of their Loyns girt, Shoes on their Feet, and Staves in their Hands. Now our Saviour eats it quite otherwise, in a Table-posture leaning, without Loyns girt, Shoes on his Feet, or Staff in his Hand, in perfect compliance with the Uniform practice of that age he lived in. And that all good order and authority was not buried with the Synagogue, is apparent from St. Paul, 1 Cor. 14. 10. Let all things be done decently and in order. Upon which Calvin: "This which St. Paul here requires, cannot be bad, unless some Constitutions (like Bonds) be added, by which order and decorum may be observed. And Melancthon in his common places, Cap. de politia Ecclesiast. throughout: "Take away the Obligation of humane Ordinances, men cannot be governed or restrained; So that let us assure our selves, that take away the Ordinances of the Church, and the Church it self is in danger. Add in the close of that Argument, "Let us look but into humane Nature, and Man-kind's way of living, and we shall find that it cannot want Ceremonies. But why do we mention particular persons? when if there were occasion to multiply words in so clear a case, we have the joynt confession of all the reformed Churches; and he who pleaseth to look into the Harmony of Confessions, may satisfie himself at leisure: We shall only mention the Bohemian, because it carries its reason along with it, C. 8. Sect.

arise for the want hereof, that this same Act of Uniformity as now it is enjoyned, is the *Partition-Wall* between the *Conformist* and *Non-conformist*, that till that be down there can be no reconciliation in this Land. The *Papists* have their Uniformity; will the *Protestant* say here that Uniformity, or the *Trent-Council*, is the means to Unity? If it be between themselves, we know it shall everlastingly hinder all Union between us and them. But why I pray doth he not take the whole sentence; and when he doth assume against me that *Uniformity is the means to Unity*, (for so he sayes expressly, if it were carefully maintained it would be) why doth he not prove too, that *old Foundations are established by new Impositions*? And if he would do that, I will tell him the way. Let us have a new moulded order or frame of Uniformity that will take in all that are sober Protestants under it, & this shall be no doubt a means of Unity amongst our selves! Provided when we have done so, we do not yet go about to persecute any others that cannot come in and yeeld to it. For when nothing will make a party stand out besides, this will most effectually do it, and increase their numbers continually. It makes them considerable if we trouble our selves with them; but if we let them alone, we render them despicable, and by making, we shall make nothing of them.

But we are told in the next place, That to make Laws in Religious Matters especially, (and by the same Rule in every thing else) is a thing, to say no more, perfectly insignificant, and absolutely useless; For, It is a Principle of a serious tender Christian, that he would not do any thing for fear, which he would not out of Conscience, i. e. As these words must signifie in this place, he will do no more for the sake of the Law, than he would have done without it; And it is a deadly Temptation against the present Injunctions, that they have

have a penalty annexed to them. Did ever any hear of a Law without a Penalty? was ever an Injunction drawn up in this form? These things we do enjoyn you to do; and if you do them, it shall be to you the same thing as if you let them alone. If the Church hath power to command us anything, we need go no farther than common sense to infer; That she hath power to punish, if that be not done which is commanded: and now that the Church hath power to make Injunctions of this nature; We have evidence enough from the Scripture it self, where we find our Saviour so far owning this Authority, as that he submitted to it: The Feast of the Dedication was of Institution purely humane, and yet our Lord observed it; John 10. 22. Nay farther, our Saviour did not only observe humane Institutions, where there was no particular command in Scripture for them; but he also did observe such as were in outward circumstances, quite different from what the Scripture hath appointed them to be in. If this seem strange to us, let us look into Exod. 12. 11. where we find the very manner of eating the Passover plainly prescribed to us, to be done in a standing posture, and that with all the punctual formality of their Loyns girt, Shoes on their Feet, and Staves in their Hands. Now our Saviour eats it quite otherwise, in a Table-posture leaning, without Loyns girt, Shoes on his Feet, or Staff in his Hand, in perfect compliance with the Uniform practice of that age he lived in. And that all good order and authority was not buried with the Synagogue, is apparent from St. Paul, 1 Cor. 14. 10. Let all things be done decently and in order. Upon which Calvin: "This which St. Paul here requires, cannot be bad, unless some Constitutions (like Bonds) be added, by which order and decorum may be observed. And Melancthon in his common places, Cap. de politia Ecclesiast. throughout: "Take away the Obligation of humane Ordinances, men cannot be governed or restrained; So that let us assure our selves, that take away the Ordinances of the Church, and the Church it self is in danger. Add in the close of that Argument, "Let us look but into humane Nature, and Man-kind's way of living, and we shall find that it cannot want Ceremonies. But why do we mention particular persons? when if there were occasion to multiply words in so clear a case, we have the joynt confession of all the reformed Churches; and he who pleaseth to look into the Harmony of Confessions, may satisfie himself at leisure: We shall only mention the Bohemian, because it carries its reason along with it, C. 8. Sect.

10, P. 12, "They do teach likewise, That there ought to be a
 "Constitution, and a certain order of administration in the Holy Church;
 "for without a Constitution, and an outward Administration for Or-
 "der, it cannot possibly go well with the Church, as with no other, nor
 "not the least Community. But now suppose the Church make these
 "Laws, how if inferiors will not obey them? For that Mr. Calvin should
 "be their Judge in his Epistle to Farel p. 9. "This hath alwayes ob-
 "tained in the Church, which hath also been decreed by the ancient
 "Synods, that he who will not be subject to the Laws of the public
 "Discipline, should be put out of his Office and Employment.

You may perceive what violence this Gentleman is forced to use to my words, to enable himself to say something against them. Who but a man set to pick out some matter, would ever find fault at so honest a rule, as that a Christian is to act out of Conscience, and not out of fear, in what he does. A formal spirit will be displeased at a sincere speech. As for his cavelling at injunctions without a penalty, he doth know I intend there those penalties they are burthened with; and he will not need to be informed that other penalties might be more proportionable to such offences. That more leaves then may not pass so unprofitably, I will not refuse to deliver my thoughts upon that matter here which presents its self, both concerning Church Rites, and Penalties about them.

For the former. That the Church hath a power to appoint Ceremonies, I do not question; but how far this power doth extend, is not perhaps so easie of determination. There is the Worship of God, and the Circumstances of it. The Worship of God it self cannot be instituted by man, but God only, because there is none can know what will please him, unless he reveal it. Besides, *Will-worship* is forbidden by the Apostle; To add or diminish, by Moses; And this is the substance of the second Com-

Commandment. Circumstances of Worship are its *appendages* or accidents, which when they go not into the essence of that Honour which we give to God according to his *Excellence* (the School-definition of Worship) do appertain as necessary to the person in the performance. Those Ceremonies consequently which are not necessary to the person who acts in a thing which God hath commanded for his immediate Honour thereby, are more than Circumstances of the same, (I will speak, surer are in my account (or according to this adjustment I make) more than Circumstances, or more than belongs to Man to prescribe in God's Worship) and let them that impose them, or use them, look to it. My Reasons are, because this is a peculiar branch of Christian Liberty, to be freed from the Ordinances of Men. Also I argue, That which is unlawfull and forbidden, the Church hath no power in; for these men do say her power lies in *indifferent* things that are neither *commanded* nor *forbidden*. But it is forbidden by the Apostle to enjoin any thing that is not to Edification. *Ergo*, In things that are unnecessary and unprofitable I apprehend the Church hath no power (that is, hath no *right* from the *Will* of Christ) to put Impositions upon us as to God's Worship, and consequently there can be no subjection due in conscience to such things. Things now that are necessary to him that acts in the Worship of God are so either *in genere*, or *in specie*. In things that are necessary any way, I am willing to own the Churches Authority, and I think I ought to submit my private judgment very much to hers in judging a thing edifying or not. When things *in genere* are necessary and not determined by God *in specie*, these are matters (we suppose) wherein our Church or Rulers power doth lie. And here we must distinguish of the

Imposition and our Submission. As for our Submission, I apprehend that whensoever our Rulers do act in their own sphear, and the things they command be lawful, we are concluded under obedience by the fifth Commandment. For the Imposition, there is need of a double distinction: The one is of those things which are necessary *in genere*, and not determined by God *in specie*; And they are either such as are *necessary* to be so determined: or *not necessary* so to be. For instance, *Time* and *Place* are Circumstances of Worship necessary *in genere*, for there must be some Time and Place, and this *in specie* is necessary to be determined, for else cannot the Worship of God be performed. On the other hand, there is the *Habit* and *Gesture*, which are *in genere* also necessary; no Minister can come to Church but some habit he must have on, and he must use some Gesture; but the determination whether it be of this or that colour, in the Pulpit *black*, in the Pew *white*, or the like, this is not necessary *in specie* to be determined; because the Service may be performed though that be not appointed. Now it is a question to me, whether it be lawful for our Superiours to determine of things that concern God's Worship which *in specie* are not necessary to be determined, for two Reasons: The one from the analogy of that Text, *It seemeth good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay upon You no greater burden than these NECESSARY things.* The other from those Rules unto which the Church is tyed in her Injunctions, to wit, that she do nothing to lay a stumbling-block before the weak Brother, nothing but what is fit and decent, and to edification. But it is impossible (according to the condition of our People) to determine such things in God's Worship as need not be determined, but it will scan-

scandalize many, and so cannot be to edification, when it is to their destruction. Nevertheless the other distinction is here also needful, to wit, between the *Matter imposed*, and the *Act of Imposing* : Though the Act of Imposing were unlawful (which yet I peremptorily say not), yet is the Matter imposed, so long as it is about that which is *in genere*, is necessary, no other than what does belong to the sphere of our Superiours, and consequently obliges the People in point of Submission.

For the latter. There are Laws Civil, and Ecclesiastical. That the Magistrate hath an external objective Power and Government of the Church, as *Episcopus τῶν ἐξῶ*, for its safety and good, it is not to be doubted : but how far this Power doth reach, and is fit also to be exerted to the sanction of Ecclesiastical Constitutions, by Penalties about Religion, it is too difficult a point immediately to be resolved. What I have published I am willing to present. Matters of Religion may be considered barely as an Act of Conscience, or as they have influence on the Manners of Men, which come to concern the State. In the *latter regard*, the exercise of Religion, or the Matters thereof, are I count, subject to the Laws Civil ; to wit, they are to be ordered so as they may not make disturbance in the State, or hinder the Politick good : In the *former regard* (if they do not so) Conscience I must confess, is such a kind of sacred thing with me, as I am tender to have it touched ; And therefore I would distinguish. There is a Toleration in the *Church*, or in the *State* and the *World*. That matter of Religion and bare Conscience, as Errors and Heresie, are objects of Ecclesiastical Coercion, there is no question, and that they are not to be tolerated in the Church, the noted Instance of the Church of *Pergamus* is undubitable : But

when a person for his Error and Heresie is excommunicated from the Church, and so turned into the World, whether he be not to be tolerated there (which is his place) let those who will give judgement. The Word of God is given to be a Rule to the Conscience; and if Conscience erre, it is to be reprov'd by its Rule. Consequently whatsoever Censures are Spiritual, and bring the authority and force only of the *Word* with them, they are proper to be inflicted on Men for their Consciences, because the application of the Word (and this is one and the most powerful way of application thereof, to wit, by Censure) is the direct and only means for its cure. But the applying of Punishments temporal, which in their natures are such as have no tendency of operation on the Conscience, they cannot be inflicted here, unless upon extrinsecal considerations, such as the Quiet of the State, or the like is. I add, that I deny not but the maintaining that Ecclesiastical Order which is settled in a Nation belongs to the Publick Quiet and Good, and so the Magistrate to be peculiarly concerned. But whether that Order, as it is now with us, or if it were enlarged, were better maintained by rigor and severe execution of Laws against Dissenters, or by gentleness, withdrawing late Acts, and forbearance. I am confirmed by the opinion of that copiously learned and eminent Politician *Bodin*, whom I have quoted in the place, from whence thus much before is fetched. I do remember also the consonant judgment of that wise Emperour *Solyman* the Great, who being spoken to by a Bashaw of his, not to suffer a diversity of Religion, in the mixture of the *Christians* with his *Turks*, in his Dominions; he opens the Window, or the Window being opened, he points to a Bank that was before them, and bids him see how the variety

variety of those flowers did not hurt, but enrich and beautifie that plot of ground, where they grew sweetly together, and hindred not one another. I see indeed this Gentleman is of another humour, and for ought that I can discern by him, quite against all moderation. I am sorry for him heartily, and those of his Opinion; and I am the more sorry, in regard of the influence such men have had so long upon the goodness of his Majesty, when the goodness of his Majesty shall one day (we hope) have influence upon them. How gracious he was in his inclinations to a tenderness in relation to mens Consciences, it is known, while he was beyond the Seas, and his face but toward his People; and I do not think that those men were more faithful friends to Him, then to themselves, who diverted those intentions; And I do think also farther, that He had need to be no less gracious then Himself is, if He forgive them all for it in the end.

To return to this Authors Book, *If the Church bath power to command any thing*, (sayes he) *common sense will infer she bath power to punish*. How? Hath the Church power to command any thing under temporal punishments? The Weapons of her Warfare are onely Spiritual. And what will the Church of *England* be able to do with these Weapons, if she useth not such besides that are not her own, in the business of Conformity? As for what he sayes after, that the Church hath power to make Injunctions, and produceth Christs obedience to such, and others Authority, what is that to me? And what is that to those Penalties he brings this for, or to the sense of this place he animadverts upon, unless Ejection (that of *Calvin*) were the infliction of the Church, and not of the State, with us? I deny not but the Church may make Her Laws and
Canons,

Canons, and impose her punishments Ecclesiastical, and that in lawful things we must obey Authority; but if she will inflict her Censures Spiritual, and the Law of the Land Temporal for any thing which is against mens Consciences, I hope then it is the duty, and will be the practice of a resolved Christian, not to do it any more for fear, than if there were none at all to be inflicted on him. And when this in effect is all I say, that which he sayes, I think might be spared.

Having now upon these several, and we hope convincing Grounds, shewed, that the Church should have a power of commanding, and consequently, of Imposing Penalties in case of Disobedience: we shall a little return and take some small notice of the first ground of this his Argument. That a tender Christian will not do any thing for fear, which he would not out of Conscience. If this be intended to represent the Gallantry of that Party, which is here Pleaded for; as being a company of Heroick Spirits, as that they may be perswaded or encouraged, but are at no hand to be frightened into any thing: We shall then say, that we never yet saw reason to believe that they were persons of such great bravery and resolution: We have heard indeed by one who knew them well (King James) That no Deserts would oblige them, nor no Oathes bind them; but we never yet heard, but they were liable to be terrified as any other Mortals. We suppose that Mr. Love may well pass for one of these serious and tender Christians, and yet Fear prevailed so far upon him, as to make him acknowledge his great Guilt and unfeigned Sorrow for his great Offence; and own those whom he conspired against, as the Supreme Authority, and promise all manner of Duty and Submission, in hopes of a Reprieve; and that this was not altogether Conscience, appears, in that when they would Reprieve him no longer, he called them Rebels and Traitors. Once again, Mr. Jenkins too, did recant then; and we are more sure that he did comply then, out of the principle of Fear, than we are that his not-Conforming now proceeds purely out of a principle of Conscience. Nay, did not that whole Party lay aside all mention of the Covenant from Mr. Love's death, till just upon the King's Restauration? Now I suppose

suppose fear had some influence upon them in this as well as Conscience. The truth of it is, they are like Spaniels, if they seem to love any, it is after they have been soundly beaten; or rather, they are of the basest of all Dispositions, who really love nobody, but yet will cringe and fawn upon any one, so long as they are afraid of him. And if this be the character of a tender Christian, to do nothing for fear; sure we are, that the tender Christian is (of all places) the most unlikely to be found amongst those who talk so much of having tender Consciences.

It is pitty but this learned man should have found out some other work for himself, that he might not have been forced to recur to the same passage; thus for want of others worthy his animadversion; for here he hath repeated this only to abuse the deceased Mr. Love, who died in the Cause of the King and Covenant, as a singular Example. He might have spared this instance with more ingenuity; and for the other person he mentions, he is alive, and can render his reasons. But when he proceeds upon these men, that they are *like Spaniels, the basest dispositions, if they seem to love any, it is after they have been soundly beaten*, he is without any reason, as well as favour.

In pursuance of the former Argument, we are told, p. 14. That if in lieu of proposing such a piece of Banishment to fright the Non-conformists into the late Oath enjoined in the Act at Oxford, there had been offered a liberty of the Ministry, on that condition, without any Penalty, the Act had been perhaps to purpose. It is to me not a little wonder, that any one who hath but the face of a man, can pretend to complain, as if there had been any severity in enjoying the Oath made at Oxford: And to satisfy any, whether that which is here called Banishment, (i. e. removal five miles from a Corporation) be a punishment any thing less necessary for the refusing that Oath, there will be little requisite besides consulting the Oath, which follows in these words, viz.

I A. B. do swear, That it is not lawful on any pretence whatsoever, to take Arms against the King ; and that I do abhor that Trayterous position, of taking Arms by His Authority against His Person, or against those who are commissioned by Him, in pursuance of such Commissions ; and that I will not at any time endeavour any Alteration of Government either in Church or State.

Now is it clear, that this Oath is not an Ecclesiastical, but a Civil Oath, made purely for the safety of the Kings Person and Authority, and was, with some addition, in force before ; and being refused, the pretence was not any thing of Disloyalty, (no, the time was not come to profess that) but because there was in it a clause for the Renouncing of the Covenant : The Parliament therefore being willing to comply, not only with their infirmity, but with their very peevishness, contrived the substance of the former Oath without that clause in it, only binding them to profess, That it was not lawful to bear Arms, &c. ut supra. Now the refusal of such an Oath as this, wherein they are onely required to swear, That they will not serve this King as they did his Father ; One would think were Confiscation of Goods, perpetual Imprisonment, or Banishment, in the proper sense of that Word ; when in, it is nothing but the being removed five miles from a Corporation. They who will not promise, not to subvert the Government, shall have the whole protection of it, with this only Caution taken against them, That they shall not live in such populous places, where they may have opportunity to seduce great numbers every day, to those attempts which they will not be brought so much as to profess for to disclaim. And yet even this is not exacted, as those who walk London streets know well enough ; and now where there is so direct, so reasonable, and withal, so merciful a Law ; One would think, that instead of complaining, they should rather express their Gratitude towards the King for his so wonderful, I had almost said so groundless an Indulgence, in not putting in execution this Act, which is so great a piece of his own security, as it is a restraint upon those who will not so much as engage themselves, not to destroy him and his Government.

The Gentleman produceth here the Oath at Oxford, which he supposes to be such as he seems to admire that any should once refuse it, and counts them worthy, not onely

only of a five miles removal from any Corporation, but of Confiscation and Imprisonment. I am sorry heartily to see such an overly spirit, and so much cruelty joyned together; and I am the more sorry to have any men of this complexion to be in power, because it is this sort of persons who look but once over a thing, and then think they see to the bottom, that are so rigorous in their exactions upon others Consciences. As this man hath writ a Book against me of the *Inconveniencies of Toleration*, there is need of some other to write another against him of the *Inconveniencies of Persecution*. I pray God turn these mens hearts, and give them more Catholick Principles, and more Catholick Charity. But seeing I have such a Call from him, and I know not who the man may be, I will humbly signifie thus much to him, that though I should, according to my Genius, and preparation of my Studies, write a Book for the taking this, and conforming so far as ever we could, possible, rather than discourage any body from it; yet, that he and others may be sensible that the humble and modest refusal of this Oath have more reason for the same, than this man and his party generally doth imagine, I shall offer these Reasons in their behalf, to his consideration.

In this Oath we have the Matter, or the form of Words, that is the *Substance*, and the *Composure*. And here are three parts of it. The first part, I argue, is not according to Judgement, the second according to Truth, the last according to Righteousness.

I will begin with the last. And I will not endeavour any alteration of Government. There is no Government in earth is so perfect that it hath need of Laws like the *Medes* and *Persians*. Alteration of Laws, and so of the Govern-

ment (in the Administration) is as necessary many times, upon emergent occasions to the politick Body, as the fresh Air is to the natural. This Oath was brought into the House to have been made common. It were not a thing righteous to have such an engagement laid on the Souls of the Parliament; it is not Righteous to have laid it on any who are Free-holders, and Free-subjects, as we are. The Constitution of our Nation, as Parliamentary, is such that no Law can be established or repealed, but it must pass the House of Commons, and so the whole Body doth concur in their Representatives to every alteration of Government that is made, if it be legal; and no House of Commons is chosen but by the People. *Every Englishman is intended to be there present, either in Person, or by procurations; and the consent of the Parliament, is taken to be every mans consent, sayes Sir Thomas Smith, De Rep. Ang. l. 2. c. 2.* Nay while the King *consilio & assensu Baronum, Leges olim imposuit universo Regno, consentive inferior quisque visus est in persona domini sui capitalis, prout hodie per procuratores comitatus,* sayes Sir Henry Spelman. This is so true, that in this sense it is, that the Laws that pass are said to be *Quas vulgus elegerit.* Now then if every Free-subject hath a fundamental liberty to choose the Knights and Burgeses, and accordingly to inform them of their grievances, and petition them for redress, and in them as their Representatives, do consent to the alteration of Government and Laws as are profitable for the Nation, how can such an Oath be imposed on any, that they will not endeavour any alteration, as this is? Is not choosing Burgeses, informing them, petitioning them, and acting, and legally consenting in them to that end, an endeavour? and that as much as can be *in their place and calling*; And no more

more then an endeavour in their place and calling was challenged by any. Is not the Foundation-Liberty of the whole People, & our selves with them, here in danger? Judge ye that are wise. For the words then (or form) I wonder at this rigor of the Compiler, that a man must swear not to endeavour *any* alteration. Had it not been enough to be engaged not to endeavour the alteration of the substance of our Government, Episcopacy in the Church, and Monarchy in the State, but must it be not *any* alteration? It were well we were so absolutely perfect. And again, must they not at *any time* endeavour any alteration? What if Times should turn, and we be in as great a confusion as we were, or any the like chance or change come? Must these men be bound up that they cannot endeavour to reduce back this Government that we now have? No, nor the King and Bishops, if the iniquity of the Times should put them out, for they have sworn they will not at *any time* endeavour *any* alteration in Church or State. Sir! The matter of this Obligation being against the fundamental freedom of the Subject and Parliament, and the words, as you see, so ensnaring, and that against that duty all owe to the publick good, I offer it you to consider in the first place whether this *last* part be according to *Righteousness*?

For the middle part of the Oath, here is a *Position* of taking Arms by the Kings Authority against any commissioned by him, which must be sworn to, as *abhor'd* and *trayterous*. There is now a case in the mouths of all the understanding refusers of the Oath. Suppose some *Writ* sued out, and comes to the *Sheriff's* hands, and suppose some to oppose the execution by the Kings personal command or commission, and he thereupon raises the *Posse Comitatus*

upon them. I will ask here, Whether the Sheriff acts not herein by the Kings Authority? I think it cannot be denyed. *By the Kings Authority*, is all one as, *By the Law*, or *(in the Name of the King according to Law)*. And when he can act so against any, (for all their Commission) and the Law will bear him out, how is this *Position* in this case *traiterous* and to be *abhor'd*? For my part, I do resolutely believe that it was not ever the intent of the Parliament in this Oath, or the like Subscription (as to the major part, we may be bold) to advance the personal *Will* or *Commission* of the King above *Law*, which were to make his *Power Despotical*, and not *Regal*. *Non est Rex* (sayes *Bracton*) *ubi dominatur voluntas non Lex*. And how this *Position* indefinitely (without exception of this case at least) must be sworn to as altogether traiterous I am yet to learn. *The Courts of Law can annul the Kings Charters or Commissions, which are passed against Law*; for the King is subject to the Law, and sworn to maintain it, sayes Judge *Henkins* in his Works, p. 48. As for the Form then of the words, *I abhor this traiterous Position*, they are harsh. The word *abhor*, especially is a word of interest and passion, a cooler word, as, *I disown*, or *disallow*, might have served. Some of the more grave (as *Calamy* particularly) were much offended at that word. I may say a thing is unlawful in my Conscience, when I cannot say according to truth I *abhor* it. There is never a Gentleman in the Land but may swear truly, that he believes it unlawful to company with any other woman as his own Wife, but if each one were put to swear he *abhors* it, I suppose some very good Sons of the Church, as well as our Brethren, would be found willing to be Non-conformists to such an Oath. Well Sir! when these words *Abhor* and *Traiterous*, are so

harsh

harsh in the Composure, and when there is such a case, and the like perhaps to it, may be put as to the *Position* in the matter of it, wherein it seems justifiable and without offence; I offer it in the next place to consideration, whether this *middle* part of the Oath be according to *Truth*?

For the first part, we have a large assertion roundly sworn. The Oath runs not onely that it is not lawful to take up Arms against the King, or that it is not lawful, on any pretence, but on any pretence (or cause) whatsoever. The Grammatical literal construction of that word, seems to intimate no less then that this Proposition must be held without any restraint or limitation. Among the most eminent of Authors who have wrote for the Power of Princes, and established it against resistance in writing on this subject, I suppose there are few or none to be valued above these three, *Barclay*, *Grotius*, *Armfæus*. And we shall find that they have all their restrictions, or cases of exception in the maintenance of this Tenent; And how shall any be over-earnest here to punish the refuser, when if the matter be scan'd, the reason perhaps why he refuses, will be found only because he hath read more then some others that take it. I begin with *Barclay*, that is *William Barclay*, a *Scot*, and Counsellor to the King of *France*, who writes against *Buchanan*, *Boucher*, and other Monarcho-machists, as he calls them. This learned man endeavours to make his Prince to be above the whole People, that consequently no Arms can be taken against him; nevertheless when he comes to put some pressing cases, he thus limits himself. *Quid ergo? Nulline casus incidere possunt, quibus populo in regem arma capere jure suo liceat? Nulli certè quam diu Rex manet.* There are cases indeed he accounts in which a King does *exuere personam Regis*, or *dominatu se exuere*, and

and particularly (l. 3. c. 16.) he mentions two, *Si Regnum alienet*; *Si Rempublicam evertere conetur*. I do not say I approve this Doctrine. The Papists use the same, we know in another case. We may not fight against our King, but if the Pope excommunicate him, he shall be no King with them. Let us come to *Grotius*, and first quote him in his Judgment of *Barclay*, lest you may think else I mistake him. *Barclaius* (sayes he) *Regii imperii licet assertor fortissimus, huc tamen descendit, ut Populo & insigni ejus parti jus confedet se tuendi adversus immanem savitiam*. For himself then after he hath asserted this Tenent, *Summum imperium tenentibus jure resisti non posse*, from Scripture, Antiquity, Authority, and Example, to as much purpose perhaps as any, he comes to put seven cases, wherein he does *lectorem monere ne putet in hanc legem delinquere eos qui renera non delinquant*. For *Armuseus* he hath wrote three learned books of Politicks, *De jure Majestatis*. *De Doctrina Politica*. *De Autoritate Principum in Populum semper inviolabili*; seu, *Quod nulla ex causa subditis fas sit contra legitimum Principum arma sumere*. Here then we have our Tenent, in the state whereof he comes in the issue to distinguish betwen *Rex* and *Tyrannus*; *Tyrannus in titulo*, & *Tyrannus in exercitio*; and *Tyrannus in exercitio*, he counts does *excidere de jure etsi hereditario*. *Traditur Respublica principi in eum finem* (sayes he) *ut illi praest in salutem omnium, a quo si prorsus desciverit, etiam de potestate cadit, quam alio fine sibi commissam habebat*. By such testimonies as these, without naming others, I would expose this Gentleman, and those persons who were the compilers of our late Declarations of this nature to be subscribed or sworn to some resentment and shame, that when the sense and meaning of them (let it be only declared by

Parliament, to be indeed no other then as he does candidly interpret them, and which has been indeed my judgment in effect as to this Oath) is such as we were not like to say any thing against, they should be yet composed *so in terminis*, as to be lyable to so grand exception. For the form then yet of the words here, *I, A. B. do swear that it is not lawful, &c.* Here is an Oath to the matter of a Proposition, and that questioned, to the determination of a point of Conscience, and that diversly decided. An Oath should be to a matter of Fact, and cannot be taken but to that whereof we are certain. To require of men therefore to swear to the verity of a doctrinal Proposition, is not according to judgement, being a thing impossible, because no man is intallible. Now Sir then, when here is such an Errata in the *Composure*, as the want of the words, *I believe*, or the like; *I swear that I hold, or believe, that it is not lawful, &c.* and so material an exception as the judgment of the most learned in general comes to, against the *Substance in terminis*, of the first part of this Oath, (which goes down yet with these men, as not fit first to be chewed) I offer it humbly in the third place to be considered, how this Oath can be taken either in Truth or Judgment? An Oath must be taken in Judgment, in Truth, and in Righteousness. The first part is not according to Judgment, the second not according to Truth, the third not according to Righteousness.

The next, p. 15, is a project of our Author's against his own Brethren; and that is, to serve them as Julian did the Primitive Christians, to keep them out of every Office and Emblöyment. And I shall thus far yeeld to his Advice, as to acknowledge, that if it were carefully followed, we should quickly see that it would have a very good effect. But we must add, that he hath put a very odd Complement upon His Majesty

justice and the Parliament in thus representing Them to be worse than Julian. But the next, p. 17. is infinitely more inexcusable; he doth there tell us how the King of Japan first put to death every man who was a Christian: This not serving the turn, he executed the whole Family where any Christian was harboured: This not doing it neither, he commanded that both that House where any Christian was found, and the next two Houses on both sides of it, should be all put to execution. And now when he did reasonably suppose, that every one who reads this dismal passage, had his heart full of horror and detestation at this so barbarous and unexampled inhumanity, he most spitefully infers, That this is the course which he and his are to expect likewise.

Lay that right-hand on your breast, weigh what I say; You must either come to This, if you see to the end; or you must come to an Accommodation. Have these men already forgot how their Lives were (by the plain known Laws of the Land) every one forfeit to his Majesty? And how earnest the King was to pass the Act of Indemnity: How Religious he hath been in observing it? And when themselves find the Government so mild, as they by this sort of scribbling dare show how little they are afraid of it; see what manner of returns they make. Ought not now some other course besides Mildness, be taken with them, who shall thus dare to Allarm the Nation, that if he and his have not their Wills, there is approaching the most horrid Tyranny which ever the Sun saw? I dare confidently say, That however these Jealousies may promise their Design, in inflaming the People; yet themselves do not in the least believe that ever such Rigour is intended toward them: and if they were more afraid, they would not complain half so much.

The Project he speaks of; that I offer against my Brethren, he does thus far yeeld unto, he sayes, that if it were carefully followed, we should quickly see it would have a very good effect. I thank him for this; for my Book methinks does turn to a good account, if this be accepted and improved. Let there only be but something more taken into the Project, which is the enlarging the established Order, to the taking in others of their Brethren, to be of the Religion the

the State owns, as well as they ; and if this be once set wide and comprehensive enough, if they find not this way best, at least at this time, for the Nation, let them blame me and chuse another. But what is this *Advice* of mine, seeing he yeelds to it ? The Contents is, that those who come up to the Order, as we desire it to be enlarged, or to the Accommodation we crave (suppose it according to his Majesties Declaration heretofore) they shall be persons capable of allowed Offices and Preferments, that is, have the King's Countenance ; and those that do not, shall have their Consciences, but no Encouragement ; and then by this means we shall most probably see in the issue that effect which the like counsel and practice had upon a contrary score, in the dayes of that politick Emperor before mentioned. If they will not allow the one part of this Advice, the Accommodation desired, yet if they do the other, and forbear all Persecution of any barely for Conscience, I shall be pleased well, though I have no benefit my self by it. In the same Page he brings in the story I mention of the King of *Japan*, and then sayes, I *spitefully* infer as if this course we did expect. God forbid ! My Argument which I frame in that story depends upon the contrary supposal. And if any man will take a guess of the sufficiency of this mans Answer to my Book, he may gather it from hence. What sayes he to the importance of the Argument ? The sense is this ; It is not any Penalties hitherto invented that will prevail upon the People of this Nation to bring them to *Conformity* ; either then they must use heavier, or they must come to Indulgence : But the former I suppose the Nation is not in case to bear, and the clemency, goodness and tendernefs of the King (we do believe) to his people, so long as they are but truly consciencious to God, and re-

bel not against him, is such, as will not permit the violent to fly to such high pitches of Severity and Cruelty, which alone is able to do any thing, if they go to do it in earnest that way. *Ergo*, they must go to another, which we beg of them, in a stated Toleration.

Hitherto we have had little but Lamentations and Complaining, that there are in general, Laws and Injunctions which they cannot away with. But now, p. 18. we are plainly told what there is in those Laws which doth so much offend them: First, negatively; It is not the Dignity of the Bishops, their Lordships and Revenues; It is not their Cathedrals, Organs, and their Divine Service, in what state and magnificence they please: It is not Common-Prayer, no nor any Ceremony of the Church, for all its significancy, if it be but a Circumstance of Worship, and no more, that could hinder most of the judicious and sober Nonconformists to come over to you. &c. These things it seems are lawful, and they can come over to them: It were to be wished that they would instruct their Profelytes but thus much as they here openly profess, and not for ever infuse dismal jealousies into the heads and hearts of the people, against those things which themselves own so perfectly innocent, and what they can at any time come over to: But hath not the irresistible evidence of Truth, here forced them to give up at once no less than their whole Cause, or at least to take away all manner of colour from it? For seeing that these things are all innocent, what one thing can there possibly be alledged to create any longer scruple? Here is a clear confession, that these men are guilty of the most unreasonable Schism that ever was, or ever can be in the World, because it is such a Schism which is in their own judgments utterly without any reason; For there is not any thing required but what they here profess that they can come over to: The Church exacts Conformity to nothing but what the very Dissenters acknowledge that all the sober and judicious men among them can come over to. But are these men to be esteemed, or Sober, or Judicious, which stand out in so causeless a Schism? which keep up so needless a Separation, and divide (not to say the Church, but) their Native Country, by refusing to do such things which they know and own, that they may do, and do them very unlawfully. But if these things do not keep them out, what doth? For these are all the things which

which the Dispute lies about ; Why ? It is these Declarations, Subscriptions, and Oaths, which you impose upon them, &c. If the former doth not hinder, I see no reason why this latter should ; For, if we may do such a thing, why may we not declare that we will do it ? If we do believe these things, why may we not subscribe to them ? And what is the harm of an Oath to a thing which hath no harm in it ? And as to the Imposition, that alone cannot alter the Case ; For if such a thing (suppose a significant Ceremony) be in it self lawful, then the Magistrate by imposing a significant Ceremony, hath only imposed that which is a lawful thing. The Law is here notoriously and confessedly innocent in every particular, because that every particular which it doth require, is owned and confessed to be innocent.

Here he cites a passage of mine, wherein I speak, as I think, according to the sense also of others (at least of some very considerable) That it is not the Bishops Greatness and Revenues, or Common-Prayer, or such Ceremonies as are no more than Circumstances of Worship, that keep most out of their Ministry, but it is those things I suppose in the Act of Uniformity which are newly imposed that stick more with them. Here any may see I apprehend that the Crosse in Baptism does stick with these persons, being that which is pleaded to be more than a bare Circumstance is. Besides, by the Common Prayer I meant and mean the ordinary daily Service of it, not including every thing in it in the by-offices, and by-occasions, I find not my self aggrieved with these things, and I suppose that many others would not be shut out of their Ministry if there were nothing required else in the Act of Uniformity besides these. But now when he falls upon us only for my kind Concessions here, that we are *guilty therefore of the most unreasonable Schism that ever can be in the World*, What reason hath he for such an outcry ? We who are upon so large principles, are guilty of no Schism, so long as

we joyn with them in these things which we think lawful; we come to the Common-Prayer, and some of us partake also in the Communion, and hold no Separation. Onely in these things which we think unlawful we forbear, supposing that what is enjoyned in the Act of Uniformity is so, at least in some particulars to us. And hereof seeing this Gentleman engages me so much, I will give him some account.

Three things there are which be enjoyned in the Act of Uniformity. Reordination. The Declaration. The Subscription.

For the formost, there are few or none I believe that ever were ordained by Presbyters but are confident of the validity of that Ordination, and it must be then on the lawfulness or indifferency of repeating Orders that those who have or do come off, must ground themselves. But what an odd thing Re-ordination is to the Fathers, Councils, School-men, and all Divines, as well as Rebaptization, who does not know, that hath read and considered any thing about it? There is *Ordinatio ad Officium*, and *exercitium particulare*; Ordination to the last may be repeated I believe; To the first generally it is held it may not. To compound us in this business; I will propose to the Bishops, that some new form be framed for this purpose, To wit, to commend a Person to the Grace of God for the work of a new charge, by the imposition of their hands and prayer.

For the Declaration of *assent and consent to all, and every thing contained in, and prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer*, and that of ordering Priests and Deacons, they are words beyond all swallow of a considerate man, unless he can find some way to mince them. I do verily believe there

there are some particulars I may instance in, that this Gentleman himself does not give his assent to. In the *Athanasian Creed*, there is this passage, that whosoever does not hold *that Faith* (to wit, as is there exprest) *entire* is undoubtedly damnd. But is there no Person think we that lives and dies of the Greek Church (who differs from that Creed in the Article *Filioque*) can be saved? God forbid! Nay rather would I hope that some who have lived under *Arrianisme*, or *Socinianisme*, yea some Heathens themselves possibly may find mercy. Well, *Titius* and *Sempronius* are men of large Principles, and both believe that some may be saved that do not hold the *Athanasian Creed entire*; nay that some *Heathen* possibly may be saved. They both of them are put upon it to declare their unfained assent to all the Particulars in the Book of Common Prayer. This is one Particular. *Titius* therefore sayes he cannot declare his assent to this, and so is ejected. *Sempronius* sayes, He does not believe it any more then *Titius*, but he thinks good to declare for all that. I appeal now to the world whether it be well, that *Sempronius* shall be a *Dean* or a *Canon* because he can lie, and *Titius* shall be none, onely because he cannot. *Titius* it may be would read the Common Prayer, and this Creed, as well as *Sempronius*, but he cannot declare in these words (if it were onely for this particulars sake) as he can; he is a weak man, and his Conscience will trouble him if he does. Another lesser matter I will instance in. In the 105. Ps. & 28. The Bible reads the words thus, *And they rebelled not against his Word.* The Psalter reads them, *And they were not obedient to his Word.* I argue here; One Particular contained in the Book of Common Prayer is, the translation of that Text. But if the Translation be true in the Psalter,

Psalter, it is false in the Bible; and if it be true in the Bible, it is false in the Psalter. That they rebelled, and rebelled not in *eodem respectu*, no man can give assent. I know *Hooker* may tell us, that both senses may be true in the minds of the Translators; the one referring the words to *Moses* and *Aaron*, and the other to the *Egyptians*; or, in reference to diversity of time, both may be true of the same persons. But I urge this more strictly. The mind of the Text it self, or *Dauids* mind whose Psalm it is, was but one; while the Translators then are contrary in their minds, both of them cannot have *Dauids* mind, and so one of the Translations must have that which is false. That Translation now it self which is the false, is one thing contained in the Common Prayer Book. But unto that this Author himself, nor any man can assent: *Ergo*, neither this Author, nor any other can declare in these words, that he assents to *every* thing, or to all and singular the things that are *contained* in this Book. There is one thing more particularly sticks with me, and perhaps does with none else. Our Common Prayer Book, according to the received Protestant Doctrine, hath laid the Visible Church upon a Foundation so narrow, that we cannot stand upon it against those who are for Congregational Separation. The Church with us consists of a number of those who have true Faith and Repentance, and consequently we require a profession of no less then a saving Faith and Repentance of all that are admitted to Membership, or to Baptisme. Upon this the Child which is brought unto the Font, before it is Baptized, is made to declare that it believes the Articles of the Creed, and that it does renounce the flesh and the world, in those actual tearms, *Credo, abrenuncio*. The Godfathers do it in the name of the Child, and

and the Child is reckoned thereupon a professed Member, and hath his right in the Church. Now besides the absurdity of this, that a Child shall answer *Credo* (from the custom of the Adult among the Antients) to all the Articles, when it is not capable of believing any one, (though the *Lutherans* indeed contend with us that Elect Infants do actually believe) and besides that this stands not with the Doctrine, that Baptisme is a regenerating Ordinance; For how shall that Ordinance be a means (institively) of Regeneration, which presupposes the party who receives it to have true Faith & Repentance, that is to be regenerate already, and he cannot be admitted to it but on that supposition and profession? Besides this I say there is this inconvenience which wrings us, that forasmuch as Profession is not a thing required for it self, but for the declaring what the Person is who makes that Profession, (that upon the same the Church may admit him) until a Person (will the Separatists tell us) makes such a profession of his Faith and Repentance that he may be adjudged by the Church, to have indeed in his heart this Grace which he professes he is in no capacity of entring into Church-relation; and consequently in regard there is in our Church no profession but that which is a Pageantry, of the Infant at his Baptisme, we are no true visible Church, that is, no number of Professors, and therefore they must *gather* from us, upon the account of this profession. For my part now I am apt to hold that an acknowledgement only of the Doctrine of the Gospel, in opposition to other Religions, with submission to the Ordinances, to the end that a man may be brought to saving Grace, if yet he have it not, is sufficient to Membership and Baptisme for a Man and his Infant. I apprehend accordingly that when the Child is made

to answer *Credo, Abrenuncio*, it should suffice (and according to the Catechisme, which is part of the Lieurgy, is to be understood only) to say *Polliceor*, I engage to it. I think *Entring* the Covenant is one thing, and *Keeping* another. The Covenant is conditional, and a person yet unregenerate, may engage to the performance, as ever he expects the benefits, when for want of performance after, he may perish. I think in brief, the Church should be held as a *School*, receiving persons in that they may be regenerate there in the use of the means (which are the Ordinances indifferently) and not a *Corporation* only of the professedly regenerate already. Accordingly I am not perfectly satisfied with those several expressions in the Prayer Book, which supposes all her Children to have true Faith and saving Grace, as at Baptisme, so at the Supper, and at their Burial. They may be conceived some of them to be without, and to attend the Ordinances to obtain the same. And then as others wil say of a Church-member of theirs, who is a Hypocrite; that though he be one that indeed in his heart does renounce Christ, yet as a Professor they admit him: So say I of the Members of a mixed Church, let any of them be such or such as is objected against them, I receive them to the Sacrament under the notion of persons coming now to the means for Grace if they have it not; that is, I admit them not *reduplicativè* as such, but I admit such (*specificativè*, in their works perhaps denying Christ hitherto, but now coming) as seeking at present in what they are doing (and according as they have greater need) their Conversion and Salvation.

I will pass to the mention of another Particular, which is the more general exception of all others. They have in the new Book of Common-Prayer, and ordering Priests
and

and Deacons, inserted several passages *de industria* that make the *Bishop* a distinct *Office* and *Order* from the *Presbytery*. They would not be content belike with a difference in *Degree* and *Eminency*, but they will have us declare to a *Jure Divino* distinction, disproved by learned persons among the Papists, and among Episcopal men, as well as the Reformed Churches. Now I would beseech them to consider whether they have dealt candidly to impose such a condition on the Presbyterian to the keeping of his Ministry, as not only Bishop *Usher*, and Bishop *Davenant*, but Dr. *Field*, and *Francis Mason*, must have been turned out as Non-conformists upon the same? I must confess for my self, leaving what *Jerome* in his Epistle to *Enagrius*, and his longer Comment on the first of *Titus*, hath put in (as the substance, for ought I see, of what hath ordinarily been said since) I cannot but be thus far convinced, that during the time *St. Paul* wrote his Epistles, the Bishop and Presbyter could not be two distinct Offices in the Church, because in the enumeration of the Officers *God* had set there, (which he hath Catalogued in three several Texts) he never reckons the Bishop and Presbyter as two of them. There are *Apostles*, *Evangelists*, *Pastors*, &c. But never *Bishops* and *Presbyters* set down as two of the number, which is not to be imagined possibly to be omitted by him, if they were then a distinct Order in the Churches account. And this brings into my mind another thing in the ordering the Priests and Bishops, which is the use of those words (*modo imperativo*) *Take thou the Holy Ghost*, it is added, for the Office of *Bishop*, as to the last, which gives the fore-mentioned offence. These words *receive the Holy Ghost*, which were spoken by Christ when he breathed on his Disciples, and did effectually bestow his Gifts on them,

which in an extraordinary manner on the day of Pentecost came visibly upon them. But it is not to be imagined that either Gifts or Graces are bestowed by the hands of men on the Ordained. What then is understood by the Holy Ghost, that we may approve the use of these words in Orders? By the Holy Ghost must be understood the *Power* that hereby is given; To wit, the Spiritual Power for the Ministry, or Power to forgive sins. So *Bellarmino* for the Papists, and *Mason* for Us. But besides, that some may not easily endure that the Words of Christ should be used to any other effect than they then had, what if the spiritual Power it self comes not, or cannot come by the hands of men (or by Orders) but immediately from Christ; as the power of Princes is not from their inauguration, but from God? How then shall we assent and consent to these passages in Orders, which are some particulars both contained in, and prescribed by the Books? *The cause why we breathe not as Christ did, on them unto whom he imparted power* (sayes *Hooker*) *is for that neither Spirit nor spiritual Power may be thought to proceed from us.* I do offer this the more freely, in relation to some who are plunged so much about being re-ordained; The Objection they have, lies here; Orders is that which gives a man the spiritual Authority for his Ministry; This they have already, and therefore they can be ordained no more. Against this then, that orders confers not the spiritual Power, I offer these Arguments.

1. It is the *Will* of the Lord of the House, is, and must be that, which makes a man his Steward, and the Ordainers can but act as *Signifiers of his Will*. But there must be this *Will* before it be signified; consequently a man must have the *Jus* or *Power* in the sight of God before he be ordained.

2. God is not tyed to Succession. Suppose a

company of Christians in an Island, and one amongst them every way else rightly qualified, takes on him this work, as called of God, without any to give him Orders. I ask, hath this man *Ministerial Power* unordained? If he hath, then must the spiritual Power come some way else to a man than by Orders. For I argue hereupon, If there be nothing hinders, but the same way as Power flows to such a man in a case extraordinary, it may flow alwayes so also to others; then are we not to multiply ways of our own without necessity. But this Power doubtless upon the one from Christs institution immediately, and why not so then also still unto all whatsoever? 3. The Apostles in such Texts as 1 Cor. 12. 7. 1 Pet. 4. 10. and the like, do argue directly from the *Gifts* to the *Duty*. But the *Duty* must suppose the *Power*. Neither does that hinder but that when a man *coram Deo* hath this, he is yet to be approved also in the Court of the Church, and so *let him use his Office*. 4. St. Paul had his Ministerial Power before (*Acts* 26. 16.) being an Apostle neither of man nor by man, (*Gal.* 1. 1.) yet is he Ordained with *Barnabas*, (who likewise was a Minister before also) *Acts* 13. 3. Ordination then is not for collation of the Power, whatsoever else you find it for in the Text. 5. The Presbyterians generally did quite omit these passages of collating Power which are in the Episcopal Form: But this were a pett inexcusable, if it cannot be alleadged for the reason of it, that the Judgement of the most swaying amongst them was accordingly. *The Donation of the Office and Spiritual Authority annexed thereunto, is onely derived from Jesus Christ our Mediator. He alone gives all Church Officers, and therefore none may devise or superadd any new Offices, Eph. 4. 7, 8, 10, 11. 2 Cor. 10. 8. & 13. 10. He alone derives all Authority and Power*

Spiritual to those Officers, Mat. 16. 19. & 28. 19, 20. Joh. 20. 21, 22, 23. 2 Cor. 10. 8. & 13. 16. *And therefore it is not safe for any creature to intrude upon the Prerogative Royal of Christ, to give any Power to any Officer of the Church.* Nihil dat quod in se non habet. Jus Divinum Regiminis Ecclesiastici, Cap. 6. p. 56.

I proceed to the Subscription. This hath two parts. The one is the Purport of the Oath before mentioned, of which therefore I shall add no more but this, That when the matter of the one and the other, in the former part thereof, is such as enters the Foundation of Politicks in general, and the Laws and State of our Land in particular (which is βασιλεία νομική, as Sir Thomas Smith hath it, *Rex sub Deo & sub Lege*, sayes Hooker and Bracton) so that it requires the skill of the greatest Judges, Sergeants, and Sages of the Law to determine the cases included in it, every poor silly Minister is put to decide the same for himself, and to have that evidence therein, as to be able to take his Oath, or give his hand to the certainty of it. The other part of Subscription concerns the Covenant, where these words, [*Nor any other*] as to the Consciences of all who are not Episcopal altogether, are such a Ford as (without some unusual help to carry me over) is, so far as I yet see clearly, impossible; It is nothing to me to subscribe that there lies no *Obligation on me from the Covenant, to endeavour any alteration of Government*, because I never took it; It was against my Conscience, and I can conceive for others in a *private* capacity, what have they to do with Government? No Oath can bind to Sedition and Disobedience. But as for such who are in a *publick* capacity, and can act lawfully toward Reformation in their place, What shall I say to those? One way there is indeed will strike off all, and that

that is to hold the present Government established, to be *Jure Divino* altogether, & that any alteration is sin. He that holds so, may affirm clearly that though a man swear he would endeavour to alter the Government, it binds him nothing, let him be in what capacity he will; The least alteration is unlawful, and he must therefore repent of his Oath, and not perform it. But if a man hold that Presbyterian Government is rather *Jure Divino*, or that neither Episcopal nor Presbyterian is *Jure Divino*, or that Episcopal Government is well; yet that ours, as it is now, is not altogether so well, but that something may be altered for the better; I would fain be informed how such a man can absolve him who is in a publick capacity (as a Parliament-man) from his endeavouring so much, according to time and prudence, if he hath sworn before that he will. It is in vain to hide where the Water sticks; there are some cannot tell how to absolve *one other* for their lives. I say not, there lies an Obligation on any to do as they have sworn for fear it be dangerous: and I dare not say there lies none, because I fear God. But this I may say, that I desire to be instructed; and this I will say, that it is a hard thing to be put on it to say that there lies no Obligation upon any other but our selves, whether there does or no. To relieve us in this grievance, and all others in the like nature with this, I propose this Remedy, To wit, that those Declarations which are required of the Non-conformist to be Subscribed or Sworn, may be imposed onely in the matter and end, and so long as he comes up in his sense and meaning to give satisfaction therein, he may be left to the liberty of using his own expressions.

But

But as for Oaths, we are farther told, That be they taken, or be they not taken, they signifie nothing. We live then certainly in a very mad Age. But of all men, the Presbyterians are the best qualified to teach this Doctrine, That Oaths be they taken, or not taken, they signifie nothing. All Europe will bear witness, that with them they have indeed signified nothing. And that, not only because there is no hole whereout a man can creep, that hath taken a former Oath, but he can get out of the same, or find another like it, in any new Oath you put upon him, pag. 20. At this rate, there must be no Oaths at all, Because too many may be tempted to break them; but I shall not make any longer Annotations upon this, because I will not presume to vie skill with a Puritan in what belongs to the shifting out of any Oath, especially if it be a lawful one; I shall readily acknowledge, that they are, of all others, the most experienced Masters of that faculty. But in confirmation of what went before, we are farther told, That there is nothing that is a mans duty, or unlawful, before he hath taken the Oath, but it remains as it was, after he hath taken it; and he will be obliged neither more nor less. (I speak as to the thing, not degree) whether he take it, or not take it. The Obligation of Oaths is certainly much stronger than this Author seems here to make it: The thing which was my duty before, if once I become sworn to it, this is a very strait Bond to tie me fast to it; my soul is particularly laid in pawn, and God Almighty, besides a Judge, is a Party to exact the thing in that I have sworn it: Not in unlawful things, the Oath hath a sad Obligation; not to do the thing, it is true; for nothing can bind me to commit a sin: but alas, by taking this unlawful Oath, I have brought my self into a necessity of sinning, let me take which course I can; whether I do the thing myself, or break the Oath whereby I swore to do it. If the limitation in the Parenthesis (I speak as to the Thing, not Degree) were intended to qualifie the crudeness of this (otherwise) wild Assertion, I am content to let it pass: I shall only add, That if we should grant these premises, he could not infer a Conclusion wide enough for his purpose, because his enumeration of particulars is very lame; for besides those things which are Duty absolutely, and those which are absolutely unlawful, there are a sort of things of a middle nature, onely lawful of themselves, but not necessary; which before the Oath I might have done, but after the Oath I must do; and this part of the Division ought

not to have been forgot, because our great contest is concerning these things of this middle nature. But p. 23, 24. the Proposer speaks home, I would to God there had never been an Oath, besides the Assertory Oath, &c. And p. 25. Indeed an Oath in civil things, that is taken of good will, is of moment; but an Oath upon constraint we abhor. Sure the wisdom of all Nations hath been strangely mistaken; if so be, that Promissory Oaths are not things of very great use and Obligation: Solomon among other Reasons by which he presseth obedience to Kings, reckons up this as one, and that not the least considerable, in regard of the Oath of God. The Examples of this in the Scripture are very frequent, David and Jonathan, David to Bathsheba concerning Solomon's Succession; to the Gibeonites, with many others: And the indispensable Obligation of such Oaths, is declared Numb. 30. v. 2. If a man vow a Vow, or swear an Oath to bind the Soul with a Bond, he shall not break or prophane his word, he shall do according to all that proceedeth out of his mouth. Well, but this, perhaps if the Oath be taken voluntarily, of our own accord: For, indeed, an Oath in civil things, which is taken with a good will, is of moment; but an Oath upon constraint we abhor. Then if any will of their own accord swear not to kill the King, these may, but at no hand we must not compel them to it. The Scriptures furnish us with many Examples of imposed Oaths, by Moses, Joshua, David, Asa, Jehoida, and Nehemiah, &c. 2 Chron. 15. 12. Asa caused the people to come to Jerusalem, and there they made a Covenant to seek the Lord God of their Fathers: but perhaps the people were every one of them Unanimous, and desirous to enter into such a Covenant: That is not likely, that there should be so immediate, and so sudden a change, seeing that v. 3. they had been for a long season without the true God, and without Priest to teach, and without the Law: And v. 13. We see a plain, and a very great Coercion used, And whosoever will not seek the Lord God of Israel, shall be slain, whether he were small or great, man or woman. Ezra. 10. v. 5. He caused the chief Priests, and the Levites, and all Israel to swear, that they would do according to this Word. And thus did all the good Kings of Judah, as it were ease to produce, impose Oaths, and that too in Religious matters: Now there were amongst them divers certainly of different persuasions, who would have been glad to have been exempt from those Oaths, as appears by their several Groves and High-

High-places (amongst which, no doubt, there were several pious and well-meaning, however deluded persons, who might have said, we worship God according to our Consciences, and the best of our Light.) But these different Lights and Perswasions did not hinder those godly, as well as wise Magistrates, from imposing such an Oath; but rather it was the grand cause or motive of such Impositions, to discover who they were who were of another perswasion, that they might be observed, and care taken of them, that they might be questioned, and if possible, in time reduced.

This Gentleman is willing to find fault with what I say, but when he hath done his endeavour, he is forced of necessity to say the same with me, *If the limitation in the Parenthesis were intended to qualifie this Assertion, I am content to let it pass.* See here how fain he would find occasion to quarrel, when there is no doubt in the least but that Parenthesis was put in purposely upon the same caution. And as for his telling us of things of a *middle Nature*, it was not unthought of by me, but impertinent here altogether, because the things that were sworn to in the Covenant on one side, and what is now required to be sworn on the other, are accounted of each party *absolutely duty*. Neither hath he any reason to trouble himself about the proving the lawfulness of Promisary Oaths, which was never denied, nor shall be by me; only I wish, how lawful forever they may be made, they were yet let alone nevertheless for all that. The Apostle distinguisheth between what is lawful and expedient, and so do I between what may be done, and what is most Politick and best to be done for our Souls and the Lands sake.

The next is a rare Reason' why there should be never any more Law made, Ruit humanum genus per vetitum; To command a thing wherein we were before left free, is enough to whet our humane nature unto opposition; to prohibit it, will make it coveted, &c.

If people do grow eager after a thing, meerly because there is a Law against it. There is but one way to prevent that, and that is, To put the Law in vigorous execution. I must confess, That a little Restraint doth sometimes whet our appetite; and that the vulgar are so silly as to desire a thing sometimes meerly because it is forbidden them; and we shall readily grant that it is thus in the instance he hath given us, That if many of the ejected Ministers who are flockt to now when they venture to preach, had liberty to say on till they had wearied themselves and Auditors out, we should see how the rowling Snow-balls would melt, and, excepting a few of the Eminent of them, their Congregations would quickly grow thin enough. We are easily perswaded, that the people would quickly see cause to grow weary of them, and do very much wonder what it is which makes them at all flockt after! How such flat, and empty, and wretched stuff, (should ever have the luck to be esteemed Gospel preaching. Page 29. I do verily hope in the Lord, That there is nothing in these fears, and dreadful abodings of many good mens hearts, about the Discipline and way of Worship in our Church, but a conceit, the Lord knows, I do not know. Is it not therefore very wisely and Christianly done of the Magistrates, to silence those Men who make it their great business to put such foolish and odd conceits into the peoples heads, who make them to fear, where you confess that no fear is? Are these men fit to have the charge of Souls committed to them, who love to keep their Profelytes all their life-time in Pupillage, under those childish and empty terrors, which you properly resemble to Ghosts and Goblins? Things which may indeed fright us very much, but it is only because we will not be made to understand that there is nothing in them: And whereas we are advised, p. 33. To root out such conceptions; we must still accept our Authors concession, That these are conceptions fit to be rooted out; and we think, that if that sort of Teachers were removed, who nourish up such silly Apprehensions, these jealousies, as having no foundation, would in a little time, of their own accord, wear all away. The next thing considerable, is an Argument for Liberty of Conscience upon a Politick account, That Liberty of Conscience is the thing which alwayes prevails, which side soever it is of. It was this which got the better of the King in the Wars, pulled down the Bishops, went along with the Parliament-Army, afterward pulled up the Parliament, and sat down and reigned with Cromwel, p. 45. Is

this the chief Art they have to recommend Liberty of Conscience to the Kings affections, to lay before Him how it murdered His Father, proscribed Himself, and sat down with the Usurper on the Royal Throne? Sure this is not intended, as that this was a likely way to endear it to the King, that it has done so much against Him: It is strange that this should be used as an Argument to this King and Parliament, to establish any thing, because it was the thing which reigned with Cromwell, and shall eternize that Mortal, *ibid.* I cannot persuade myself, that one, who only intended to supplicate for Favour, would ever have pleaded so unsuitable a Motive: I rather, therefore, construe it as a Tacit Threat: This is that which Liberty of Conscience is able to do; and if you will not grant it, you have felt its force once already, and you know not how soon you may feel it again. But of all the things which are here said in the behalf of Liberty of Conscience, I cannot chuse but smile, that it is here said to restore the King, p. 46. Surely the Church of England may say without boasting, That her Sons were the truest, the most constant Subjects the King had: You cannot name any other Party in the Nation, chuse where you will, but something may be Objected, as to their deviation from the strict Rules of Loyalty, among the Nobility, Gentry, Citizens, Countrey-men; if there were any who were beyond their Neighbours eminently Royallists, they were likewise noted as eminently Prelatical; These were the men who made every other Government uneasy, by dissenting from, and upon all occasions opposing of it: All other Denominations set up, courted, owned every usurping Power, engaged, addressed, did what they could to make an Interest, while the Episcopal Perswasion alwayes held off. These were alwayes Praying, Pleading, Plotting for the King; when according to your own Confession, the tender Consciences were pliable enough to be bent any way; and your Darling, Liberty of Conscience, as you are not ashamed to tell us, made no scruple of Conscience, to sit down and reign with Cromwel. But if in Cromwel's time, you were one of those who enjoyed the Liberty of your Conscience, we are sure that we could not enjoy the Liberty of ours: Was not Prelacy, as well as Popery, excepted in the Instrument of Government, that Liberty should not extend to that Perswasion? Was not the reading Common-Prayer a thing then prohibited? and that under no less a Penalty than Deprivation, and sometimes Deportation for the third committing such an offence? An Episcopal Divine was then forbidden to Preach, or so much

much as to keep a School. Let us remember the Major Generals, and then we shall not forget what kind of Liberty of Conscience that was which sat down and reigned with Cromwel. This is, I must needs say, a bold way of making a Proposition to the King, to tell him of Eternizing of Cromwel.

Do I say, because the nature of man is apt to be whetted by restraint, therefore there should never be any more Laws made? No: yet the present effects that *Restraint* hath at this time upon the spirits of men, is one good reason, among others, for relaxing some Laws that we have. In the next place, is my hope, that there is not any such evil in the Worship and Discipline of our Church as some good People are apt to doubt and fear, a ground for him to infer, that the sober *Non-conformists* therefore put, and love to keep their people in those fears, and are not fit to have the charge of Souls? No: yet will I tell him a better way to rid the People of their fears than to remove such Ministers, and that is, to remove those things which are the matter of their doubts, and the causes of their fears. Again, What is that I say shall eternize *Cromwel*? It was the raising up such a Principle in base and mean Fellows, as was able to mate the Bravery and Spirit of the Gentry. Why does he not quote my words, or the sense, if he will say any thing to me? And what is there in all this truly for me to answer, but onely some slight overly abuse? which may passe, to make him smile if he please, for pretty, about *Cromwel*, as well as that he had before, as prettily, in his animadversion about *Julian*. Indeed I do take it kindly from him, that there is nothing very base or malicious against me as he goes along, however he expresses himself every where too engaged and bitter against those who were of the other party in the late times; I do not know but my self may be

as little concerned for them perhaps as he, who have had more ill words from *Presbyterian* and *Independant* both, heretofore, for what I writ in those dayes (who was still for some composition in my mind, and moderation in regard of the *Episcopal* party then, as I am now in regard of others) than he gives me upon the score in hand. However certainly, so far as the one party and the other upon conscience (even of the Covenant alone which they had sworn) did joyn in the Restauration of his Majesty, there is a mutual respect and love due to one another, and it were more Christian and convenient for him (I conceive) to joyn with me rather for a relaxation of many things imposed, than for the putting the Laws in *vigorous execution* (as he speaks) towards the procuring Uniformity in this Nation. Indeed there are some expressions here besides the matter, as there are some too yet fresh on my mind before, as, where he is perswaded that the Common-Prayer *repeated by heart*, would make a man be *accounted of great gifts that could pray so sweetly*, and where he tells us from some body else, that *there is no such dangerous way of libelling as that which is called a good Gift of Prayer*, which (though I cannot methinks so well tell why, seeing I am one who myself the older I grow do like the better of a set-form for the Publick) are displeasing to my Spirit; I pray God sanctifie my heart more, for such passages as these do not taste methinks as they ought, of a Soul that hath been touched with the Spirit of Grace. Neither do I approve altogether of so much vilifying our ejected Brethren, which argues rather weaknesse and vanity in his judgment, than any real disparagement of them, when he tells us so flatly, not only that if they had liberty *the people would soon grow weary of them*, which in part, as to many such as myself,

self, I believe true : but, he *wonders*, and that *very much*, *what it is makes them at all flockt after* ; how such flat and empty and wretched stuff should ever have the luck to be esteemed Gospel-Preaching. A very pleasant (if it were not withal too, a lesse pious) expression of the Gentlemans modesty, perspicacity and ingenuity.

Page 47. *We meet with a Query very impertinent, I wonder how it was brought in — about the Bishops Revenews — and about the Covenant.*

In this place for two or three Pages he mentions two of those three things whereby I argue with those who steered hitherto at the Helm, to this effect, that they having failed in their Politicks in some things, it may be believed that their Advices were not good also in the matter of Conformity and Religion. Thus is it, I bring these things in, that he may not pretend to wonder at that which is expressly in the place ; and as for what he sayes for their justification, I shall forbear to mention it, or to reply to it ; only what I have said, and what he hath said, let those consider that will.

There are among the Non-conformists, sober and godly men, which are to be compounded with ; and there are zealous and giddy, which are to be born with, &c. But how are we sure that it will not displease the former, that we bear with the latter ? We do very well remember, that there was a time that themselves would not have done it, and that they were very angry with those who did do it. What Composition, or what Toleration will serve the turn, we know not : But if themselves will once agree upon it, what it is which will please them, each and all, they shall then know more of our minds concerning it. For the latter of these sorts, it is proposed, viz. The zealous and giddy, That there may be a Liberty granted to these People, for Assembling

bling according to their Consciences ; (*a rare contrivance this, that there must be a publick liberty to giddy Zeal !*) but their Meeting places should be open, (*that others may turn giddy, by beholding their giddiness*) that so if they speak any thing against the State there may be some ready to bear witness of it : *Alas, How easie is it to couch Sedition in words very innocent of themselves, so that the Law shall not be able to take advantage over them ; and yet the Antitoxins shall very well understand their meaning !* But if this be not Caution enough, we have one more, That no man be suffered to speak there, who is not forty years of age, at least thirty five. Now these two Cautions he supposeth will render Conventicles very harmless. And truly we like them only thus far, as they have something of a Rule in them ; for the lesser liberty they have, the lesser harm they will do ; the more a Conventicle is bound up, the less it is of itself, and consequently, the less mischievous : But we doubt, that this Caution will not be sufficient ; because, when men arrive to those years, they may perhaps be more wary, but not at all the less dangerous. But why may not some of those, whom this Rule excludes, reply upon this Proposition, That he who makes it, is himself a borderer upon Antichrist ; and that his feet stand upon the very brink of Babylon : He hath in him so plain a tang of an imposing-spirit. Must the motions of the Spirit expect, till he arrives at forty ? Hath not a man a Conscience, and that a tender One, till he is thirty five years old ? Must precious gifts wait till we are of such an age ? What is this but a contrivance of man, a plain issue of a carnal Spirit ? Liberty of Conscience ought to be left to its own liberty, or it cannot possibly be called by that Name. Does the Scripture tie us up to such a year ? And who shall dare to impose what Christ hath left free ? What ever answer you would return to so wild a Discourse, think upon and try, whether it would not justify the Magistrates proceeding altogether as well as your own ? you will find there is a necessity of a Rule, and then your great pretence for each private Conscience, stating its own Liberty, is utterly and unavoidably laid aside and gone.

That which I meet with here and otherwhere, does make me muse at what it is this Gentleman would have, while he professes somewhere he knows not what we would have,

have, and tells us accordingly, That *if we will once agree upon it what it is will please us, each and all, we shall know more of their minds about it.* Is this a trick in good earnest only to turn this great matter off so, that we must stay till all and each man is agreed? Or hath he Commission for what he sayes, from those that can do something in this Affair? Why then, in this very place where he requires to know our minds, he sees mine openly displaid. There are two sorts I say of those who cannot conform. The one are such as are of sober Principles, and fit for Concord. The other are such whose Principles are otherwise, yet their lives Innocent. For the one of these I propose an Accomodation, and for the other Indulgence as the means for their reduction. Toleration is a large word that may take in both these, and accordingly must be distinguished in the signification of our meaning, as we apply it to the mentioned persons. Toleration *in genere*, hath my vote freely for All. But the Toleration I would have for the *Fanaticks* is one thing, and that I would have for the *sober Protestant* is another. For the Sober, Godly, I require upon the score of Conscience, of Equity, of Religion, of the safety of the King, the Church, and Kingdom, a Composition; For the others I propose Indulgence, as the better way to reclaim them than the severity of Laws or Persecution. I do not onely propose the thing, but I offer also the means for the Accomplishment; I do tell him *what Composition and what Toleration will serve the turn*; which he sayes, they *would know*. For the former, the *Accomodation* I propose, it consists in such an allowed Latitude to the Sober Godly, as to their Opinion and Practice, as the Declaration of his Majesty for the compofure of the Bishops with their Brethren at his return did conceive reasonable.

sonable between both. Here may this Gentleman read what I propose, or what I have proposed for our Union, or *what the Composition* is will serve my turn, if he is pleased with it. Here is a thing I offer, and the means to effect the same. That Declaration passed into an Act, I have said, Will do our business. Who is there for one, can say any thing fuller? Who can propose any thing better? There is *Goliath's* Sword behind the Ephod, there is none like it, give us that. For the latter, the *Indulgence* I propose, is a freedom from Persecution, and also restraint in reference meerly to Conscience, only a due provision of security being allowed to the Interest of State and Government of the Land. In particular I do propose the *Fanaticks* should have Liberty of their Assemblings, provided that care be taken of these two things. That they will let none but grave persons of staid years be their Teachers, and that their Meeting-places be open; to the end, to wit, that they may not Preach Sedition, and if they do, they may be lyable to accusation, and to suffer as evil-doers for the same. Unto this I suppose generally their Churches will consent if it be offered by the State, at least as to the major part of every Congregation. And as for this Gentleman too here, he is pretty fair, and tells us, that, *Truly they like these two proposed Cautions thus far, as they have something of a Rule in them*; but this he argues then will justify the Magistrates proceeding farther also then thus, in laying stricter Rules, Laws or Penalties upon them; on the same account. I answer, Suppose it will justify the Magistrates proceeding farther then thus, and setting what Rules or Bounds else he shall see fit upon this said score, to wit, as necessary for the Interest of State: yet is the Question remaining whether the setting any other Rules than these

these or the like mild things unto these men (as the temper of our Nation at present is) be for the Interest of the State, or Church indeed at this time, yea or no? There are none of these Laws I hope are, or are to be made, but for reducing of these men again to Unity and Uniformity: But the way we have tried hitherto by rigor, we are sure hath been unsuccessful to this end, and therefore must we do and undo, and do nothing, or find out some other.

That the Interest of *England* lies in the Protestant Religion, as that of *Spain* in Popery, is said by the Duke of Rohan, and received by us. The Protestant Religion then is to be the Religion of the King and State. That which is the State-Religion ought to be of that Comprehension, as to take in the greatest part and strength of the Nation; It is not therefore for the State to suffer that Uniformity in the Religion which it professes, to be so narrowed up as that the Non-conformist shall out-balance those that do conform. There must be consequently such an Uniformity contrived, as shall take in so many under it, as will secure it against the Papist and Sectary, or else it stands upon a Foundation that will not bear it. The doing this I call an Accomodation, and the Kings Declaration I account being made a Law will effect it. Let us suppose then all that can yeeld to that Declaration to be of the State-Religion, and Conformists, who thereupon are capable of all the encouragements which the States bestows, without difference as to the Kings and States common favour, though they differ in some little Opinions and Practice, as all men in the world do in other things, and trouble not one another for it. Those that cannot come up to that Accomodation, must expect no countenance, preferment, or enjoyment of publick emolument; but they shall enjoy their Consci-

ences without persecution, and that we are to suppose will so abundantly suffice those that are sincere, as they will bless God that hath given them rest, and if you catch them upon rebelling for any thing more, they shall give you leave to hang them up: Those that are not sincere, will not abide by it to their disadvantage, but see their motives from without. Lo here that Toleration stated on both parts, which I would offer for the beginning of our Peace. A Toleration not stated without an Accomodation with the sober, as well as Indulgence to the Sectary, will break us perhaps more to pieces, and do nothing else: But a stated Toleration, which shall consist of a Composition upon the terms of the Kings Declaration, as well as Indulgence, will recover us (through Gods Grace, to a reasonable good condition at present, and by little and little unto soundness and strength in its due time. This opinion do I tender to the Wisdom of a Parliament either to stretch or pare away from it, as greater consultation shall see best. But if any would have me to speak more, we must come then to consider what there is in the Kings Declaration, that both sides will stand upon. As for Bishops, their Dignity and Revenues, Cathedrals and Organs, and the Magnificent Service of God there, it need scandalize nobody, seeing if they like it not they may let it alone and go to other Churches, and have their liberty there by that Declaration. I must confess, if I had influence upon the Bishops, I would advise them to two things of their own accord, that those who should be thus accommodated to them, might the more heartily become one with them, and the others be brought in. The one is, I would have them be at the pains (though they took time enough to do it) to have a Common-Prayer framed throughout altogether in

Scripture-expression, that no mortal wight should ever pinch at it: and I would have the Cross in Baptisme resolved to be laid quite aside, without any more trouble. My reason for the one is open, that every one might be convinced and ashamed that would not come to it: And for the other I should alleadge thus much only, that the same reason there was for the Church to relinquish other Ceremonies, it hath also to relinquish this. *The Ceremonies in use amongst us* (sayes Mr. Hooker) *are retained in no other respect saving only for that to retain them is, to our seeming, good and profitable.* We are content with those onely (sayes the Common-Prayer Book) as be apt to stir up the dull mind of man to remembrance of his duty by some edifying signification. Now the Cross being a Ceremony applyed to Children, who are incapable of any thing signified thereby to stir up their minds to their Duty, and so it being manifestly retained without their profit to whom it concerns, we see this reason appearing for its relinquishment. But this same reason is otherwise to be enforced: To wit, that by the same reason as we retain the Cross in Baptisme, we may retain the most of the other Ceremonies in Popery that are relinquished. As we use a Cross to signifie that the Child must fight manfully under Christs Banner, we may use the Chrisme wherein that Cross was made, which signifies the Christian Anointing to that Combat; and we may say on forward. There is nothing can be replied hereunto in earnest, but it is true, if the Church pleased to enjoin it, so we might. Consequently I urge by the same reason, as the Church hath left the Chrisme in Baptisme, it may leave now the Cross also, that is only if it please so to do. And that it should do so, there is cause enough, if there were nothing else but this onely; that as for all other Ceremo-

nies enjoined we can plead that they are but Circumstances of Worship wherein the Church hath proper Authority to appoint what is decent and orderly, and what she hath appointed therein as in her Sphere it must be obeyed: But as for any solemn Rite which is no Circumstance of the Ordinance unto which it is appended, or any wayes *in genere* necessary thereunto, if this also be enjoined, we shall have no bottom or banks set to the appointment of Ceremonies, how far this Sea should goe, and no farther then so. Not that I my self do quarrel at this, or any of the Ceremonies besides (which are not voluntary, but appointed), as most do, meerly for their being *significant* in the stated account of them, when if they were not indeed so, the Compilers of the Common-Prayer would have accounted them (I perceive) unprofitable, and relinquished them. It is one thing therefore (I account) to make a Rite to be *Exhibitive of Grace*, and another to make it *Significative of Duty*. A Sacrament I know in the Catechisme after *Austine*, is defined *an outward and visible Sign, of an inward and invisible Grace*, and some of our Rites you may say are made to be such. But this is not all the Definition, we must not cut off there. A Sacrament is an *outward Sign of invisible Grace* (such as remission of sins) *given to us*, &c. Note that. Now if any Rite of the Church be made a Sign of invisible Grace *given*, or to be given to us upon the use thereof, I shall see a good reason of my dissent from her Liturgy till that be removed. For let me offer a little light here. To say the Church in such and such Rites makes a kind of new Sacraments; take the word *Sacrament* in a common usage among the Antients, and this is nothing if you understand not where the evil of so doing would lie. And where is that?

that? Why a Sacrament being a *Sign of Grace given* to us (that is of the Grace of Gods part which he gives) thereby, there is none can be the Ordainer of such a thing but God onely, because it is he alone that can *promise* that Grace, and *give* the same by it. If any mortal then should bring in such a Rite into the Church, and make it an *exhibitive* Sign, that is a Sign of the Grace of God *given* by the same, it were a most strange presumption in imposing upon the Almighty, manifestly, as if he should be tyed to exhibit his Grace according to the will of man, or upon an Institution of his, the evil and horror whereof must appear in the mention of it. But to make any circumstance of Worship, any piece of Decency, Ceremony or Rite to be significative only in putting us in mind of that Grace which is our Duty (not as what on Gods part is given hereby, but what is) incumbent on us to exercise and stir up our selves unto at all times, whether we use that Rite or no, and whereof it is good to be still put in mind, I apprehend not my self the harm therein, at least not such as that this signification should make such Rites to be Sacraments, any more then the *Fringes* were made so on the Jews Garments, for keeping them in mind of Gods Commandments. I shall not, I hope, be looked upon to write this for the hindring any condescension of our Superiors in such things as are indifferent, nor that I am ignorant how much easier it were to bring down Uniformity to the condition of our People, then to bring up our People to Uniformity. But in regard there is nothing readily to be offered (at least by any single person) that is comparable to that Declaration of his Majesty for an Agreement and Peace: If the Conformists will meet their Brethren so far, it is fit (I account) that the Non-conformist who comes in, should

should be ready, not only to declare the satisfaction of his Conscience upon those terms, but also to vindicate such a Uniformity to his utmost for the reduction of all and every one, if it were possible, as are gone farther than reason in their oppositions.

But p. 61. He readily foresees, that a much greater Latitude than himself intends, will be apt to get in at this wide door of Liberty of Conscience; and therefore he takes care to shut it against the Papists. There is nothing more Plain, than that if these Arguments of his are valid, they conclude for the Papists and the Turk too, If any one of them be a man of Conscience, and that in his Religion he act according to it. But the Parliament will provide well enough in that matter, p. 62. No doubt they will, but we are sure that they cannot Possibly do it but by doing that which this whole Book is designed against, viz. In imposing Penalties in matters of Religion, and exacting those Penalties too, although those whom they exact them of, should happen to be really Conscientious.

This Objection in reference to the Papists I have my self prevented, and what doth he accumulate? Why nothing, only he stands upon it, that my Arguments do conclude for the Papists, and all that are men of Conscience in their Religion, and act according to it; and that the Parliament (as I say) will provide well enough in that matter, but it must be, by imposing and exacting penalties on such. Unto this, although I apprehend it a great mistake, to think those Arguments deficient to their proper purpose, which prove more than their purpose, believing rather that such Arguments are to be accounted much more valid for the *less*, which will hold for that which is *greater*; and that other Reasons may sometimes be counterpoised about the *greater*, which cannot be brought as to the *less*: yet do I chuse here to reply more fully and punctually as followeth.

We

We are to know that there were two parts even now of that Toleration I propose, the one consisting of a *Composition* with those whose Principles are fit and capable for Concord, and the other of *Forbearance* towards others. The Papists, no doubt, and all the Consciencious in my account, are in the same predicament with the Sectary, whom I desire not to be persecuted for the sake of Religion, onely the Interest of State and Church secured. It is true, we have Laws very severe against the Jesuite and Seminary Priests; but this I suppose to be upon the ground of the States Interest being Protestant. The Supremacy of the Pope, and Authority of the King are inconsistent in this Land. The Priest and Jesuite are taken by the Law for Factors of the Pope; and an undermining the Supream Authority in all States is a capital Crime. But as for the common Papist who lives innocently in his Religion, he is to me as other Schismaticks or Separatists from the Church, and so comes under the like Toleration. That is, he is not to expect to have Power or Trust, being not of the Religion of the State, but he shall have the enjoyment of his Conscience without wrong; and if it be only Liberty of Conscience that he seeks, that I hope will be sufficient to him, seeing he can in reason desire no more. It hath been therefore a piece of the greatest prudence in our Gracious Sovereign at present to take away all offices from those who are of this profession; not onely because hereby his Peoples fears are secured, but because they themselves are hereby fitted for that Toleration which is proper to them in our State, that is to have liberty from Oppression, but no countenance from the King or State, which is peculiar to Accommodation. There is prevailing Popery, or Popery subjugate. Of the one I am afraid at
my

my heart, (The State must look to that, that is against the interest of State): I am gentle towards the other.

Page 66. *We meet with some Proposals to alter divers of our Civil Laws, As Enfranchisements of Servile Tenures, enjoying every one to buy his own Tythe, and the money laid out in Glebe; A Register of Estates, Tenderness toward Consciences. These are fine Projects, and if the Author thinks it worth his while, he may deal with those who are most concerned in his designed alterations; But the first of them makes us doubt, that the man may be inclined to be a Leveller; and so we leave him to the mercy of the Landlords. But these Inventions do delight our Author so very much, That he thinks that they alone are security enough for the Everlasting Peace of the Nation; and they are enlarged upon as if the man really thought that there were something in them: For, when things are brought about, as he hath contrived, then there must needs for ever after, be amongst us a calm and a most settled Peace: For saith he, Where there are no hopes from Innovation, no body will go about to make it; But when a People have all that can be had, &c. then there will be no hopes from an Innovation; Ergo, When these things are taken into consideration, then shall our Government of Monarchy in this Land, (leaving the persons of our successive Sovereigns unto Providence and their Chances) be out of danger for future Generations. What is here meant by (leaving the Persons of our successive Sovereigns unto Providence and their Chances) I wish our Author had further explained himself; But as for his contrivance to settle things at that pass, that no body should have hopes from, nor desire to, an Innovation: I dare say that this Gentleman is no Statesman, in that he supposeth such a thing so much as possible; this thing is only then to be hoped for, when there will be no Ambitious, no Revengeful, no Discontented, no Poor, no Mistaken man in the Nation. There will be alwayes those who wish for a Change, because that there will be alwayes those, whose present condition is not altogether so splendid as they could wish it to be: In the most happy Times, some will really be, more will fancy themselves to be, unhappy. Our Author some pages backwards, tells us, That if he is mistaken in the Argument he there prosecutes, he will shut up his Table-book, and make no more Observations from Experience. Truly I shall even give him leave to do so, seeing that he hath learnt no more from it, than to believe*

believe that Innovators are in earnest, when they profess that they take up Arms only for the common good.

The title, subject and end of my Book, being a Proposal for the happiness of the Nation, there are three things besides that I mainly treat upon, which have layen many years (for the things themselves, though not for the number) as highly conducing in my opinion, to the more perfect good of the Land ; which therefore notwithstanding I apprehend, how grating soever they may be unto some complexions, and how hard it will be to find a man of so generous an English self-denying heart as to venture upon them, I do set down as it were on the file to posterity, if the present Age shall think them fit to be passed. These my Antagonist hath misrepresented, blending the first and second of them together, and cutting off where he opposes, turning my general into particulars, which requires therefore a repetition ; and I shall accordingly give you the passage, as it is more intire in my Book in the second Edition , together with the mentioned instanced things more at large in the way, as also his *Answer* and my *Reply* to the same. “ It hath been I see the policy of late transactions, to endeavour to root out those *Principles* from
“ mens minds whereby they have maintained the lawfulness of former Sedition and Rebellion, and hereupon
“ hath the renunciation of the Covenant been so pressed
“ in our Oaths and Subscriptions : But if the Policy of
“ those first Wheels that move others, had been rather to
“ root out the *Causes* from us, which make men willing
“ to entertain such Principles, I do humbly suppose that
“ Policy to have been the deeper. The way to establish
“ the King’s Throne in the Hearts of his People, and to
“ do it for ever, is this ; to make it appear that all that

“ Good (to wit, *substantial Good*) which they ever expected
 “ (or can expect) from a *Change of the Government*, or a
 “ Common-wealth, may be had from Him (or from a
 “ Prince) in the Acts of his Parliament. Whatsoever
 “ things then have lain upon the hearts of the Commons
 “ to make them *endeavour* our *Changes* of late, in hopes
 “ thereof, and do secretly yet lie there to make them wish
 “ for the like, upon the conceit that they may possibly have
 “ such things thereby, as the present Interest of those that
 “ should yeeld to them in the standing state, renders to
 “ unlikely, as near to a not-feazable without the same:
 “ These are things, I take it, to be sought out by our sagest
 “ Ministers of State, as matter or work for Parliament
 “ consultation. There are certain things of this nature
 “ (as to me they seem) I will leave upon record; at which,
 “ as I know that many are aptest to except, (But why? or-
 “ ly because they are too great, too publickly good, too
 “ difficult for the attempt:) my own conscience hath the
 “ most deliberate content. I have reduced them to these:
 “ An Enfranchisement of Servile Tenures, as the King hath
 “ dealt with Wardships. A Commutation of Tythes (sup-
 “ pose by a Law enjoyning every man to buy out his own,
 “ and the money to be laid out in Glebe). A Register of
 “ Estates. A Tenderneſs towards mens Conſciences in
 “ matters of Religion. The first of these I understand
 “ chiefly of Copy-hold Lands of Inheritance; which kind
 “ of *Hold* is most frequent in the Counties about *London* that
 “ were associate, and it was not a little Spirit I am perswaded
 “ the Cause received from such hopes (I mean that such
 “ *Hold* should be made *free*) in those parts. To prevent
 “ the like, why should not the Gentry be willing to break
 “ the *Yoke* to the Commons, as they were to have it done to
 “ them

them by the King in their *Capite Lands*? Which motion though, is not once to be thought to pass, but upon a righteous yet merciful consideration, to be set by a Statute. The next of these, the business of Tythes (which this Author, as a concerned man perhaps, seems not willing to name) is a matter of that consequence, as not only the Husband-man hereby, who complains so grievously, and is discouraged in his Tillage and Improvements, shall be eased: The Minister, whose life is made bitter to him through his contentions with his Parish (if he lives there, and hath a care and love of his Flock) about this sort of maintenance, be relieved: And the Gospel it self, in the Power or Effect of it (which calls so loud therefore for the thing to be considered) be promoted: But this great business of Toleration (whose Cause I am pleading) will be found not to be able well to subsist without the same. For let us but trace the footsteps of *Separation* to its original, and we shall ordinarily find this to be the beginning of it. The people are angry about their Dues, so take offence at the Minister; then they are but *Hirelings*, and away they go to the Fanaticks; and when they come thither, and proceed so far to make it matter of Conscience to pay no Tythes, Who is not sensible of the sad issue throughout the Land? The third of these, as I apprehend, hath in it that conveniency, both in regard of mens peaceable possession of their Titles, and also a better stated way of contribution and supplies to his Majesty for the necessities of the Common-Wealth, that there needs nothing more than a little consideration and integrity to the doing their Countrey good, with the pains of settlement, to carry on such a thing without obstacle through the Votes of most persons. The last of them is that thing which is the main

subject of the whole Book, and these Papers. " That
 " man of publick Spirit (I go on) who could wisely mo-
 " tion these four things, and be able upon righteous con-
 " siderations, to carry them, if it were but to get something
 " towards, as the abolishing of Herriots in the first, and
 " some moderate Explanation of former Acts in the last,
 " shall be valued by me in all true honour, for a Hero of
 " his Countrey, or one who is seeking the more excellent
 " establishment and durable good of his Nation. It is not
 unknown that the expectation of some regulation of the
 Law, I mean not the Nomothetical part (or that which
 concerns the Justice) which is so wholesome for the Land,
 but the Eristical part (which concerns the Lawyer), in
 Suits and Actions (whereby the very Estates of many have
 become their burthen and undoing), and more particularly
 that some order would be taken about Tythes, (at least
 those that are *impropriate*) and the like things, as well as a
 liberty in Religion (unto which a preheminance of inter-
 est yet must be attributed in our Nation) were the Engines
 that raised the Spirits of our People so high as they were,
 into late Commotions; and of what concernment then a
 due consideration of what may be done in such matters,
 would be to the fixing of a lasting quietness against future
 occasion, I need not tell any Body. It was *Cromwells* en-
 gaging against Tythes more particularly, as I have learned,
 got him up into his greatest trust with his Party, who when
 he came into Power, and the Law and Tythes continued
 unaltered, fell again from him, called him Apostate, and
 did as seriously seek and pray for his destruction. " Where
 " there are no hopes from Inovation, no body will go a-
 " bout to make it. But when a People have all can be had,
 " all that can come to a settlement with Judgement and
 " Righ-

“ Righteousness by the present Government already, then
 “ will there be no hopes from Innovation. *Ergo*, When those
 “ things are taken into consideration by the Parliament (or
 “ Parliaments) and after mature debate and consultation,
 “ come to be concluded upon ingenuously and sincerely,
 “ *wisely* and *righteously*, which have been on the hearts,
 “ and in the design of the more publick-spirited in these
 “ late times *rudely* and *mildly* : then shall our Government
 “ of Monarchy in this Land (leaving the persons of our
 “ successive Sovereigns unto Providence and their chances)
 “ be out of danger for future Generations. That which
 my *Antagonist* here answers is this, That *I am no Statesman*,
 and *so long as there is the Ambitious and Revengeful*, and the
 like, *there will be the desire of a Change*. But really this is
 prejudice, and these are exceptions only of an once-think-
 ing man, who considers not the things he contemns. That
 which he objects against me is prevented in the sense and
 comport of that Parenthesis, which he tells us, as he goes
 along, he does not understand, and yet doth proceed on
 to be my Censour. Who doth not know that the individ-
 ual persons of all Governours must be liable to the com-
 mon passions, animosities, injuries, iniquity, calamity, and
 accidents of mankind ? But as for the Government it self
 of Monarchy now established in opposition to a Common-
 wealth, or a *New Change* ; that shall be secured I count by
 these things. Again, There is no doubt but particular
 men will have their several wayes of vent for their malice
 and lusts : But what is this to the Publick Spirit, which is
 that alone that over-rules and overturns the state of Na-
 tions. The question is then, What is the way to secure this
 Universal National Spirit ? In the security of that, lies the
 Interest of Government. As for what he suggests more-
over

over (as so much wondrously wise, he thinks, above me) that Inovators do in earnest intend their own ends, when they profess for the common good. I reply also, That supposing this to be true, so far as it will hold, that is as to a few concerned men, who would have perhaps the Bishops Lands again, and what they have lost: Yet shall Toleration, accompanied with the like publick good things as these, *disarm* those silent Grandees of the total Faction; who when they have nothing left them to say for the stirring up the Commons to discontent, the Weapon is taken out of their hands, and they incapacitated for doing longer hurt: For, as for their own concerns and losses, they may grumble to themselves, but the People cannot possibly therein be concerned at all with them. And thus have I (I thank God) discharged my Political Conscience, when as for the contempt of this Gentleman, I value it no otherwise, than of a man in other things, that knows not the worth of what he contemns. And what indeed can be expected else of the un-publick spirited, that favours of that onely which is formal and customary? And therefore is the *Puritan*, it may be, so peculiarly hateful to this Person, because there is a *greatness* in such, in point of *Religion*, as there is in these things in point of *Political good*. *If thou be wise, thou shalt be wise for thy self; but if thou scornewest, thou alone shalt bear it.*

These Proposals being over, There is a long pittiful Address; the sum of all that which it is founded upon, being p. 72. Do you know that many of these things are really against mens Consciences? and would you indeed have any such to do them, though they be so? If these things are really, and in good earnest against their Consciences, we are sorry for it, and do not know how to help it, but themselves do, or when they please may do so: In the mean time, why should not this
 Author

Anthoi joyne with us, in condemning those Preachers which infuse such needless jealousies into the peoples heads, which himself confesseth (as we have often observed) that there is no real cause for? Himself confesseth that they are not more panick than empty terrors; he resembleth them to the fear of Faies, and supposeth that there is nothing in them. But which now think we should give place? The publick Law, or the private Conscience? especially in our Case, where the Apologist owns the Law as to the matter, to be in the right, and verily believes that the Conscience as to the scruple is in the wrong. But what is now to be done as the case stands? The command is onely to a lawful thing as it hath been often granted, but it is believed to be unlawful: I shall answer this which is the grand fundamental doubt, out of the words of one of the chief Ring-leaders of that Party, (and for his sake, I hope they meet with a fair Reception) Mr. Baxter in his *Disputations about Church Government*, Chap. 15. p. 483. If we do through weakness or perverseness, take lawful things to be unlawful, that will not excuse us in our disobedience, our error is our sin, and one sin will not excuse another sin; & paulo post, It is their own erring judgment that entangleth them in a necessity of sinning till it be changed; with much more to the same purpose, in that whole Chapter throughout.

He comes here to my last Argument which is from Conscience, the sum whereof he sayes is this; *That the things imposed are against mens Consciences.* It is true, and our Rulers consequently should be tender, lest they be the occasion to many to do that which to them is unlawful, and so they shall wound their Consciences; and if they sin against their Brethren, and wound their Consciences, they sin against Christ. *Wo to the World because of Offences.* *Whoso shall offend one of these little ones that believe in me, it were better for him that a Milstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drown'd in the bottom of the Sea.* What can this man now say hereunto? or, where is that mortal can say any thing in the earth more convincing and unanswerable,

able, to a Christian Parliament, why they should withdraw these Acts than this, to wit, in that sense, as it is urged in my Book? I do not think it easie for another, and I am sure I am not able my self to speak more to the purpose, and to the life, upon this Argument, the direful experience whereof hath set the force of it so deep upon my heart. And is this indeed all the regard that this man gives to it? That it is *a long pittiful Address* according to him, and so he passes it. So we shall hear many a careless hardened Gentleman come out of the Church, *It was a long pittiful Sermon*. God have mercy upon such mens souls. It is indeed an Address that is *pittiful* in a good sense, that is, which should move those to whom I apply it unto pity; and I am sorry that this person, who in likelihood is a Minister, and either hath, or hath had, or may have the charge of mens Souls, could read so many lines (especially if they were indeed *long*) and have no more bowels towards his Brethren. I am sorry, and I can but be sorry, for I perceive whatsoever comes experimentally from the Conscience, these formal sort of learned men, as well as the profane, have no feeling of it; and let it be never so honest in it self, and moving to others, it does but raise their indignation. But yet shall that little here he hath quoted be accompanied with this Testimony, That it hath made some impressions upon the man, when there is so little sign from any thing else: *If these things are really and in good earnest against their Consciences* (saith he) *we are sorry for it, and do not know how to help it*. Lo here, and what say I? Yes certainly they cannot but believe many things are against mens Consciences, and they do know how to help it: viz. by removing of those Laws that enjoin them, and coming to Accommodation. As for the comparisons I have used

in reference to the dreadfull apprehensions which many good men have of the *Hierarchy* and their Impositions, I wish they were not too much in earnest, and too feeling, yet I hope in God things are not so as such pious men do conceit them; *I know not*, I have said, *God knows*. I am tender therefore what I say therein: But as for what he urges by way of Answer, that *the publick Law must not give way to private mens Consciences*, and then brings Mr. *Baxter* (whom I readily acknowledge for a most worthy person) to decide the business, this Gentleman understands not what he sayes, or at least what he should say here, upon this Argument of mine from Scandal, which I offer to our Rulers for relaxation of those Laws which have, and do scandalize so many. We must distinguish therefore of things lawfull, and unlawful; and of the Imposition of the Laws, and our Submission. When things are unlawful we know that they are not to be obeyed though they be imposed, and the *Apologist* does not own all our Laws to be right in the matter, as this man speaks here and other-where without truth; Nay, he questions whether any of the three things required in the Act of Uniformity be right in the matter or no, and then that which Mr. *Baxter* is brought for, does no service. But the fallacy which this Gentleman sees not, and therefore does neither understand Mr. *Baxter* nor himself, is a transition *à genere ad genus*. The Argument, as I urge it, is in regard of the *Imposer*, who as he imposed the Law, can recall it, and must do it for the sake of mens Consciences, or he must answer to God for it: and not in regard of the *Submitter*, who if the thing be lawfull, I confesse is bound to obedience, and his weaknesse or perversnesse, as Mr. *Baxter* saith, will not excuse his disobedience. As for the *Submitter*, I say I acknowledge it, if a thing be lawfull

in it self, and yet evil in a mans Conscience, it is true Mr. *Baxter* sayes here, It will not excuse a man from sin : But yet he will not say, A man must not do that thing while his Conscience is in an error, but he is bound first to lay down his error, and then upon satisfaction do his Duty. But as for the *Impyser*, Mr. *Baxter*, I am assured, will agree with me as to the force of my Argument, that the *consideration* of the grievous scandal which is offered to so many tender Consciences as there is by these late Acts, is an unanswerable Reason why they ought not at first to have been imposed, and now why they should be relaxed, upon the discovery of the evil which many perhaps before understood not. It is not that many people are *displeased*, and *angry* only or *grieved*, or in regard so much of those that stand out, wherein the force of this does lie, as if because of that a publick Law should be repealed, or not passed: but it is in regard of those rather that come in, because many people shall by these Laws be induced to sin against their Consciences, and so by their coming in be wounded and destroyed, and this is no other than *murder*, the most pernicious murder, which does therefore put a Bar to the passing such Laws at first, and is a reason for their relaxation if they be passed. Will you say, We *will* induce our Brother to go against his Conscience? Will you resist God, and are you stronger then he? Alas! that we cannot get men to have a right apprehension of *scandal*, against which so heavy a charge is laid by Christ and his Apostles. That is scandalizing a Brother in Christs sense and his Apostles, which is an inducement to him to do a thing against his Conscience, upon which alone is he said to be *damnd*. Now when there are so many things imposed which (as the People of *England* now are) are against mens Consciences,

ences, and so much against them as they are, the enforcement of such impositions upon the tender Christian, are directly forbidden of God in such Texts as commands that we must not *scandalize our Brother, and destroy him for whom Christ died*; for if we do so, and he (by our pressing him to do more then he can) wounds his Soul, he may never recover it again while he lives in point of comfort, and in point of danger, it may loosen him in his Integrity, and he perish for ever. If any say to me, as the Disciples to Christ, speaking of Marriage, then it is a hard thing to marry. If this be true, then it is a hard thing to make Laws. I say so it is, that concerns the Conscience. For the Church to determine her Doctrines, and make her Canons, so long as she uses onely her spiritual Sword the Word of God, there may be good profit and little danger: But to give a civil sanction to things that concern the Conscience, under such Penalties as our Impositions have, I do think it does require so much caution, as it will be very hard for any mortal to justify the imposing of what of late has been done, when yet if the things commanded be lawful in the matter, I am ready to plead for, and justify the Submission. It is not enough certainly for our Governors to have a care that the things they impose be lawful in themselves, (which in the Declaration of Assent and Consent, and Subscription in so strict a form of words they are in, cannot be,) but also that they impose such as are not like to scandalize the Obeyers; for the things which are scandalizing to our Brethren are forbidden, and so unlawful. Let Dr. *Hammonds* Tract of Scandal be consulted what he makes Scandal, and how strict he is in this point. So that we may do nothing, (to set down his own words) though to us never so lawful, which we have reason to fear

that another who thinks it unlawful, may yet without satisfying his Conscience be likely to do after us. Now, what think you of this? You see wherein the nature of scandal is placed with him, And what shall we conclude upon the Imposers, but this? That it is not lawful for them therefore to impose that upon people, which they have reason to fear that many, esteeming the same unlawfull, are like to do upon their Imposition and Penalties, before they are satisfied or can be in their Consciences about them; *He that does them, and doubts, is damned if he do them. To him that esteemeth it unclean, it is sin.* How then shall a conscientious Magistrate go to impose such things as to so many multitudes of People is esteemed unlawful, or at least they are in doubt it is so? How shall they do it, I say, for fear lest many of these who *doubt*, who *esteem* the same unlawful, should yet do them, and so they be guilty of their damnation and of murder, the greatest murder, which is destroying of their Souls? There was indeed but one *Spirra*, and all the World rings of his name to this day: But how many in this Land have by the late Impositions of both sides been brought into the same case, in a less degree, God knows; when through present fear or allurements (as his case was) they have yeelded to that which was, if not wholly against, yet not altogether according to their Consciences, and so wounded their own Souls. If the Bishops, or any other leading persons, shall not be affected with this Argument, so far at least as to have due compassion towards their Brethren, the Lord Almighty will plead with them one day about it; And in the mean while, will I plead with them, who have had the Hand of God upon my Soul herein to make it so sensible of what I deliver, to this very end, for ought I know, that I may do it. *I have*

set thee as a Watchman, sayes God, and if he warn of the Sin, and of the Judgment, he shall free his own Soul, though what the effect may be, I know not. If I glorifie God, I shall be content to bear my own shame, and mens reproaches, and give praise to his wonderful Mercy in what is passed. I humbly think it very conducing to this end to record this Story. For what is the praise or dispraise of man, in comparison of giving God his praise, and the owning of him? Let me, O Lord, serve thee with my strength, but yet mayest thou fetch honour to thy self, yea also good to thy Church (in the caution of others) out of my infirmities. If I glory, (sayes the Apostle) I will glory in my infirmities.

I knew the man that in the late Times was inclining in his Judgment to the Kings Cause; I know this hereby, for being an *Oxford*-Scholar and in the Parliament Quarters, he contrived with some of their Horse to go from them to the King, and meet him at *Oxford*. He was no Souldier himself, but having his Degrees in the University, did betake him after, according to his education, to the Ministry, and being in the Countrey, without any acquaintance of any Bishop, he took Ordination of the Presbytery, conceiving it a matter indifferent at that season. It pleased God in those dayes, that the Sacrament of the Lords Supper did as it were lie waste in most places; They who were for gathered Churches, administering it only to their own Members, and others to those only whom they selected as *visibly worthy* by examination. This Person therefore according to his small Talent and Ability, writ two or three Books for *Free-admission to the Lords Supper*. Upon these Books, it is no wonder if generally he was accounted a man of the old stamp, and so like to be no favourite of those Times. I

sensible how much those Books did at that time serve the
 Episcopal cause (though not without acknowledging also
 their tenuity), both because Free-admission was that thing
 which struck at the Foundation with the People, and also
 the reading those Books did keep alive a memory and de-
 sire of something they had before, which stood the same
 in stead in its season. If he did well, the glory be to God;
 If he did evil, the good Lord pardon it. According to
 these Principles, as he had never taken the Covenant, so
 did he never joyn in Association with the *Presbytery*, his
 Conscience was scrupulous and he kept it to himself. Not
 but he accounted those that did associate, his pious worthy
 Brethren, but he was not disposed so in his inclination.
 After some Revolutions, it pleased God that the hearts and
 faces of the Nations were towards bringing the King to his
 Inheritance, This person being herein more ready in his
 good will, than wary of his own security, did liberally de-
 clare in his place for an Accommodation with the King, as
 the only means to our Happiness then, as he thinks of an
 Accommodation still to be the only way to the same now.
 He was forced to use the best advised terms he could in
 the expressing himself, but he alluding one day more open-
 ly to that Text of the Prophet, *I will overturn, overturn,*
overturn, until he come whose right it is, and I will give it him,
 a Warrant is sent for him from *Okey* for a Seditious person,
 and a stirrer-up of the people unto Insurrection. It wrought
 him at present a great deal of perplexity, but the times
 growing on to a perfect Restauration of his Majesty, that
 danger (of his life and fortunes for ought I know) blew
 over. Well, with the King *Episcopacy* comes in again to
England. Some there are at Court not unwilling to remem-
 ber this person for preferment. He is one understood not

the way of those things : but being spoken to accidentally by the Bishop of his Diocess to come to assist with others in an Examination unto an Ordination, he ingenuously declares to him, that himself was ordained only by *Presbyters*. Upon this the Bishop makes it his advice, his request, and is very importunate, that he will therefore be ordained again by him. Without this he accounted no favour would passe above. This person told him, He had no doubt but the Ordination which he had was valid, yet knew not any thing at present against iteration of Orders if there were need. He was not willing to such a thing, but who can resist the Argument of Kindness and Civility? In short, his Consideration is disturbed, a day or two passes, but he is prevailed upon, and this *fatal thing* is submitted unto, is done. It is not for me here to set forth what the reflection upon this afterwards cost this poor man. He finds his soul wounded, he is diseased, oppressed; The more he thought or read, the more are his objections encreased. These objections as they stuck in his spirit, he writes down, and answers for himself. This becomes a little Book, entitled, *The Question of Re-ordination*. He did not know but this might be the design of God's good Providence, that he should be touched, for the healing of others. A great many were satisfied by this Book, and re-ordained, and have had peace in it. One or two writes against it, and it was God's good hand upon him that they did so, for his own grief is not yet asswaged, or terrors ebbed, but for the stronger flowing in their return. This gives him rise to write again. A hard case he is brought upon. What is neither against the moral Law, nor positive Institution, he finds not in his heart to condemn. He may condemn himself, his Opinion weakly he must not condemn : He distinguishes

guilnes therefore between his Opinion that *Reordination* is not wholly unlawful, and his own Fact, under the circumstances he took it: Between the thing, and his doing it, His doing it (while he was not fully perswaded in his mind about it, while as yet there was no necessity for it, while he was in the same charge, and while he was not provided against the scandal as to others, besides the end, looking mainly to compliance and advantage) was grievous to him: when the thing it self, as to others, he thought might be innocent. He heartily repents therefore, discharges his soul of, and renounces what himself had done (seeing there was no way else for his peace) but yet ceases not for all that to bring the best assistance he could possibly for the support and justification of his Brethren, who either had or should think it better for them to submit to it, and found that they were indeed able to bear it. Before this second Discourse on this subject comes out, and he yet under the hottest of this distress, this person goes to the Bishops Register, calls him in private by himself, tells him his trouble and desires him to let him read a Paper to him, the contents whereof were much to the purpose in English, as are in Latin in the tenth Section of the Discourse mentioned. It pleased God that the man heard him with patience to the very end, but as soon as he came there and took out his Orders, tearing them before him, in confirmation of what he had read, he burst out into that passion that nothing can still him, but running down into a Room where company were, he makes his exclamation; whereat this person thinking in his conscience he could do no lesse, acknowledges the thing and the reason of what he had done, and in attestation of the same, takes the pieces, and bidding them witness it (as they might if they would), throws them

them in the fire that was before them. This troublesome atchievement being over, that second discourse of Re-ordination is put out. Several there were who conformed (and were reordained), and who conformed not; and both parts received their establishment from that Book. For immediately hereupon the Act of Uniformity came out. This person amongst others is fain to give up, he could not have lived if he had done otherwise at that time. Being now out, and his soul (through God's mercy assisting so far) being now much more at ease, there was yet something behind (as the waves beating still when the storm is over) that must make the rest perfect. He had dispatched one instrument of his Orders as is above recited before the Register, but this was his Orders for Deacon (for the Ordained must submit to two), when those he had for Priest he told them at the same time that he reserved, in regard he knew not but they might be necessary to his Ministry, and his Conscience was afraid therefore at that present to serve them as he did the other (although if he had, I have reason to be perswaded, it would at once have done his work and given him his ease). The other Instrument then remaining on his hands, with some impressions on his spirit, he takes an honest plain-hearted and seriously affected man alone with him into a Chamber, and there telling him of his affliction he had hitherto undergone, and what he had done, he desires him to be witness to the last office that he was now to execute and devote to his relief. Hereupon he produces the Orders that he had left, and tearing the same first in pieces, as he had done with the former before (and imploring withal no doubt God's compassion) he throws the one part of it so torn into the flames (which he had caused to be enkindled there on purpose) and the rest of it so can-

celd and torn, he wraps up in a Letter to the Bishop, which was sent, and accordingly (no doubt) it came to him. A Copy of the Letter he took and laid by him, unseen by any but that witness, until now he makes it thus publick to the World. The Letter was thus.

Right Reverend & my worthy Lord,

I Have been very sensible of your great kindness intended, which became the heaviest snare and affliction to me that could be in the world, when you perswaded me to be reordained by your self after a former Ordination by Presbyters. I was long in distress of spirit thereupon, and never at rest until I was constrained to go to your Register, and tear those Orders again before his face, and threw them in the fire. Those Orders I then cancelled before him was only my Orders for Deacon: I durst not do so with those I had at the same time for Priest also, because I did not know whether they might not save me the enjoying my Ministry, unto which my Conscience then would enjoin me, and therefore I kept them still: But now the Act of Uniformity, with the Bartholomewtide following, is long past, and I, with so many others, hereupon are out for Non-conformity thereunto, I do perceive that this Instrument lying by me, is like to be of no more use to me than the other, so that I may serve it alike. Accordingly, and upon the same terms, (to wit, according to the terms of the Latin in the tenth section of that Book, entituled, A second Discourse about Reordination, which Book I left for you when it came forth) I do tear and cancel this same also, and giving part to the flames, do put the other part thus cancelled and torn into this Paper, that you may see unto what a passe the trouble of a mans mind sometimes may bring him to get his peace again when he hath for-gone it: which the Lord of his mercy make of use to your Ho-

nour for caution and tenderneſs toward others. If Re-ordination be ſuch an heinous thing as Divines ordinarily ancient and modern, Councils and Fathers do make of it, it is well for me to renounce it altogether : If for all what men do ſay, there is yet no ſin indeed in it againſt God, though a man be ordained as often for the ſake of his Miniſtry as there is need, then may one who is diſtreſſed in ſpirit as to a ſecond Orders under ſuch circumſtances as he could not bear, caſt off them and take a third or fourth under ſuch as he is able to bear, when there ſhall be nothing elſe in Conformity that ſticks with him beſides, as there does yet with me. There being no inconſiſtancy then in my writing to hinder the doing what I have done, I conclude. When Luther heard that the Pope had burnt his Books at Rome, he took his Decretals and burnt them at Wittenburgh : Even ſo ſay I, When the men of this Generation do make our firſt Orders by the Presbytery to be void and null, to the ſcandal of ſo many Miniſters at home, and Churches abroad; Let theſe ſecond Orders of theirs be rendred by me accordingly, null, void, cancell'd, given to the flames, in teſtimony unto the validity of that former Ordination (ſuch as then was and could be had), and againſt the iniquity of former Impoſitions.

Your moſt affectionatly, though unfortunately
engaged, humble Servant.

J. H.

Lo here what a Riſque of two or three years or upwards, was this poor wretched perſon fain to take, to get into that Harbour again he ſet at firſt out, and it is the infinite mercy of God that any ſo afflicted a creature by the running ſuch a Gantelope as this, ſhould at laſt come to his peace ; which after I have told all this, there is no man (I

will presume) that hath any bowels, will be offended with the miserable for his seeking of. For what heart of any *Scythian* or *Tartar* could desire that one should live under so intolerable a load upon his soul (that my Pen is not able to express the horror of, and a narration of it is not for a wise man to give any otherwise than thus) rather than he should take that course he did (wherein I shew not how the remedy was adæquate to the wound, as being not fit indeed to be opened so far) to be rid of it? There being nothing, as the Lord of Heaven best knows, in the beginning, middle, and end hereof, but distress of Spirit, which nothing else too would ease him of but this, and all this, and no less than all this, which he did. But when that Renunciation which was laid upon his heart to do, was by proceeding in these degrees, at last fully perfected, he found that God (for whose Cause he hath humbly born this Testimony) released his Soul, without any return since of any afflicting thoughts about it, and which finally till then was not released. O the merciful dispose of God, who is the God that disposeth all things, and is full of mercy.

And now I know not what influence the recording this Adventure may have upon any of our Rulers, or those Christian-hearted Gentlemen, who are in a present capacity of reviewing our late Acts: but I am perswaded that many of them that fear God will bear with me, much the rather, for the streis that I lay upon this Argument from Conscience, though my Opposer regards it, I see, only as those did the invitation in the Parable, *And they made light of it.* That I have reason, suppose you will press upon people something that is against their Consciences. Either they shall obey it, or refuse it. If they refuse and suffer your Penalties, how will folks be ready streight to look upon such as

kind

kind of Martyrs, which will but certainly encrease their numbers, and so the Laws be frustrate of the end they intended ; If they obey it, and for fear of the Penalty submit to you, then do they wound their Souls, and are murdered, and who that is a good man, can take any pleasure in being an occasion to them of doing that ? They should indeed be convinced of their error, and so obey ; but what if the things that be commanded are not altogether perfect, but in some regard truly unlawful ? And if they be lawful, who can think the passing of a Law only, can make a man see that which was against his conscience before, and to him unlawful, to be lawful, and according to his conscience streight, as soon as that once is but passed ? I must needs call here all those that are in Christian Power, to tenderness and due consideration. There are the Consciencious I account, and those that have no conscience. *The Law is made for the unrighteous*, and in inflicting the penalty, supposes the person not consciencious. The executing the Laws upon such that break them only for want of regard to God and their duty (suppose a man will not come to Church, nor goes to any private Meeting) does seem most proper, and is a means to reclaim them : But the executing the Laws on the truly Consciencious (I speak it in the business only of Religion, or in those things only which concern the Conscience) is not like to do any thing on them. Consider we therefore again, that there are lesser and greater penalties ; when the penalty is lesse, and not such as is like to induce a man only for the saving thereof, to admit a thing against his Conscience, the inflicter (or Christian Justice) may be the more bold, for an example to others, though the man himself be not reformed : But when the penalty is greater, and such as is like to prevail upon the person rather

rather indeed to forsake his Conscience than to endure the grievousnesse of it, Here the Lawgiver and the Inflicter (or good Justice) had need both to be wary, lest in passing or prosecuting the same, they do become guilty (against their Brothers Soul) of a breach in the highest degree of the sixth Commandment.

But after all this Dispute, suppose at the last that it should not be Conscience, and in many of their Leaders we have great evidence, that it is not so. At the Conference at Hampton Court before King James Dr. Reynolds, Mr. Knewstub, Mr. Chatterton, did clamour as usual about Conscience as any now do, or can. But when the Arguments upon which their Consciences pretended to be founded, were to their own Conviction, all weighed and answered, there was then desired an Indulgence for some few worthy and sober men, because of their Credit: And are we sure Credit hath nothing to do in this case? Men are loth to use the Ceremonies, lest they should lose the Credit of that Zeal which hitherto formerly appeared so much against them.

From this Dispute at Hampton Court this Gentleman doth gather, that it is not Conscience, but regard of Credit which makes the Nonconformist desire Indulgence. I am sorry he should say so, but I will parallel this inference with a passage of his elsewhere; from whence any man may collect more shrewdly, what is that which indeed sways some why they desire the Nonconformists should not have Indulgence. *To relax a Law (saith he, p. 26.) upon the account of Conscience, or the pretences of a higher degree of Purity in the same Religion, is as much as to proclaim the Dissenters to be the most really Consciencious: That those who do conform, are meer Formallists, Time-servers, Compliers with that which is uppermost: but the Non-conformists shall be taken for the Sincere men, who walk according to Light, and to keep the Gospel pure without the mixture of humane inventions.* Lo here

here the discovery of their very hearts. It seems these men are indeed afraid (that is the plain truth of it) to lose their esteem in the Nation, if those men who are more serious and painful Ministers than they, be tolerated: but whether this be a plea that will stand the tryal, if the Parliament come to search into it, we may see in due season. In the mean while let us remember the Admonition of our Lord, *Judge not, lest you be judged. For with what judgement ye judge, ye shall be judged; and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.*

But pag. 77. It is not the severity of Laws that can do any thing with the mind, though it may with the outward man: Force may make men Hypocrites, not Converts, to a Faith which is enjoined, &c. *To this we answer with S. Austine, If it doth not remove the Error, yet it may prevent its spreading. If it doth not utterly take away the Cause, yet it hinders most of its mischievous Effects; and in a little time it may do the other too. Heresie is not seated so solely and altogether in the Mind, but S. Paul thinks fit to rank it among the works of the flesh; it hath often-times no sublimer motives, than many other of the most sensual transgressions: outward considerations are very frequently its Cause, and may sometimes be its Cure. And this our Author himself assures us of, That this is the best way to fetch in others, who certainly will grow weary at the long-run, when they shall have work provided, but no Benefice till they conform: One of his own Projects depends upon this, that the having no Benefice will be a most effectual means to make them in time willing to conform. I shall only add to this, that these are very bold Beggars, who whilst they are pleading for Indulgence and Moderation, cannot forbear to throw out threatenings. If the Bishops will not, &c. They may write down in the Books of what shall be hereafter, *Moniti meliora*, p. 8&c. This is something of the strain of Martin junior, *We have sought to advance this Cause of God, by humble suit to the Parliament, &c. Seeing now the means used by Us have not prevailed, if it come in by that means which will make all your hearts to ake, blame your selves.* Bancrof. out of Mart. p. 144. Dangerous Positions and Practices.*

Whereas

Whereas he tells us, that Error is rancked amongst the works of the flesh, and that oftentimes, it having no sublimer motives, outward penalties may serve for its cure, and then addeth, that one of my Projects depends upon this, That the excluding men from any Benefice will make them to conform. Thus much one would think were well said. But if you take it in relation to what is spoken, or any confutation of me, it is an egregious prevarication, and argues the judgment of the Gentleman of much defect. It is want of judgement to speak apt things and not to the purpose. That which I was saying is, that the severity of Laws works not upon the mind; it may make men hypocrites, it converts not their hearts. Here is a man to be supposed sincerely of the Opinion he professes; And that which he in effect sayes, is, That those that are not sincere in their Opinions will be brought over by Severity. And as for that passage where I say, the not permitting any to have a Benefice (or the States-Countenance) unless they conform, is the way to fetch some in, I speak it expressly with contradistinction to the sincere in the place; and therefore either this Gentleman fails in his judgment, or else he abuses me altogether.

There is one Concession behind, which we are to thank our Author for, that He seems p.86, 87. to hold it unlawful to expect Deliverance from any but the King: We desire only to know whether all the Party which He pleads for, be of that mind too. Mr. Hooker assures us, that your predecessors were of the Opinion, That their way was to be set up whether her Majesty or the State will or no. Hooker Pref. of Martin, p. 28. and in the Kings large Declaration, concerning the Tumults in Scotland, p. 409. We meet with several of their Positions laid down amongst which, this is one; It is lawful for Subjects to make a Covenant and Combination without the King, and to enter into a Band of mutual defence against the King, and all persons what-
ever;

ever ; and yet there were two Acts of Parliament at that time in force, which declared all such contrivances punishable with death. And we do not at all doubt, but that if we had a mind to it, we could give one considerable instance within the memory of man, how this whole Party here pleaded for, did unanimously, and with great vigour list themselves apace, did contribute their Persons, Prayers and Purse, toward the forming and maintaining of an Army, to say no more, not raised by the King. It doth therefore highly concern these People publicly to disown their Predecessors, and their own Principles and Practices, or else they cannot expect to be believed in This, so seemingly Loyal a Concession, That it is unlawful to expect deliverance from any but the King. I do not remember any other passage in this Proposition, to be at all Considerable ; only one Notion he hath, which is scattered up and down his Book, that penalties and Rigour doth but alienate their minds farther from us ; whereas Indulgence would work upon their Affections, and by degrees upon their Judgments. Now on the other side, we think, and that upon the grounds of experience, as well as reason, That there is not good nature enough in them for kind usage to work upon ; of this we shall give one, but that shall be a most convincing evidence. The Kings Majesty, immediately after his most happy Restauration, being desirous to satisfy so many of all Parties, as did not resolve for ever to remain unsatisfied, did accordingly give so much respect to the clamours then made against the Liturgy, as to order a review of it. But withal did, by his Declaration set forth about that affair, desire, that so many of them as would be thought Conscientious, or peaceable, would in the mean time read so much of the Liturgy, as themselves had no Exception against : an easie request one would think ; Read only so much as you have no exception against : Here Conscience sure could not be pretended, when their own Conscience (nay their very jealousy) was the only Rule which was set them to walk by, yet they stood it out, only because there was no danger in standing out : and after all, the Act of Uniformity brought many of the fiercest to read the whole of that, of which before they could not be brought to read a syllable ; so much is a Law more available than an Indulgence : And, as many did come in that Bartholomew-tide, so (had there not been so great expectation of a Toleration) we have reason to believe, that many more would have come in.

I am beholding to him for his acceptance of what I have spoken loyally, for it was not without consideration. He need not therefore bring me into the number of those whom he conceives to be contrary minded, and thereupon would deny us Toleration. But whereas he sayes there is not good nature enough in the Nonconformists, that any kind usage should work upon them, in regard that upon the Kings Declaration, they would not read so much of the Common-Prayer as they could. There were indeed two Opinions at that time amongst such concerning that Matter; Some (and perhaps the most) grave men conceived if they should do so at that time, it would give occasion onely to their Adversaries to grow more upon them, and therefore they would stay for an Act of Parliament: Others thought it ingenuous to gratifie that Declaration, and did read Common-Prayer (at least as to part of it) thereupon, yet at *Bartholomew-tide* the time following, were ejected, for going no further according to the Act of Uniformity. As for the *Apologist* I can say he is a man who used the Lords Prayer, the Creed, and ten Commandments, which is a kind of indisputable Liturgy in those times, which favoured not such things: and one may guesse of their own accord, of which of the two sorts mentioned he was like to be. Indeed, if I can guesse myself aright of him, it is not so much out of the byas of his Principles that he left then, or out of Faction, but out of Distresse and Affliction. And if it were not for fear of a return of some impressions on his Soul, the hazard whereof he is not lightly to run, he would perhaps even now be a thinking, whether a man might not enter the Vineyard again, and yet keep his Conscience; whether he might not be ready to declare and subscribe so far as he can, and re-

solve

solve to do no more. And if he should publish here so much (that if he does, none may think he does otherwise than so) and upon the tryal they will accept of that, and let him passe, it may be worthy of consideration in such a case what were fit for a man to do. I must confess if I found the disposition of my mind to be for our Gathered-Meetings, and I thought I could do God such service therein that there were need of me, as one that could do any thing more than others, or so, I should not I think be afraid of a Prison or other danger, unlesse of vain glory only to suffer so. But seing we are to lay things together, When there is a profession of Christianity, as the Nation is Christian, in opposition to other Religions, wherein we have all a common interest, and are to joyn in our publick Worship and Acknowledgement of his Name, so that unlesse there be something which is sinful required as the condition of our Communion, it appears to me to be Schism to withdraw our selves from the same; When I am very sensible of that exceeding weakness, as well as Spiritual-pride and intolerable Censoriousness, which is incident to the Separate Parties of several humour, and have methinks a feeling of something else, which in the upright of them is Superstition, in others Faction, ill nature, and the fruits of it; When there is such a super-eminent degree of Faith and Zeal above others, is necessary to those that can have the heart to withdraw from the ordinary Christian who goes to Church and Common-Prayer, or else they must personate what they are not (in a great measure), which is no wayes agreeable to my inclination, who am more cold in my belief, not dogmatical, and very low in the Grace of God and his strength, I humbly beg his Pardon and supply of my defects; When I can think

nothing should ever work upon another that is forced, and not done naturally, with integrity and plainness of heart; neither is my soul at ease but in such an unfeigned openness and exposure; I say, when I lay these and the like considerations together, I find not any thing to me more ingenuously desirable, than that they should relax some of their late Acts, that if I be again a Preacher, I may do it in a way which is *common*, as one that pretends nothing that is *otherwise*, without shew or ostentation of any piety or parts more than very ordinary, but lesse rather than the least in some regard of all others: and then methinks as being in the Office, there is nothing arrogant or pretending, but a man may go and do his duty in the Puc or in the Pulpit, and if he can approve himself to God and his own soul without hypocrisie, he shall be happy. If I may then be admitted into the Ministry again without any cloggs, and find my heart to be fit for, and free in it, it is (I know) what I should desire of the Almighty: but if the wounding my conscience be made a condition of entring, no abatement be given, and we cannot help it, *Fare it well*. What is this Priesthood but a Ministry, a Service? If I have no People, and am out of Service, how am I a Minister? He that hath no Flock, is no Shepherd. What hinders then, but if my heart cannot serve me to conform, I may put off my Black, and take another Calling? Unless thou hast a Gathered-Church, it is *ex dono*, not *ex officio*, thou dost conventicle. And unless thou art an *Evangelist*, or an *Apostle*, to be a Minister of the *Universal Church visible*, is a ministration easier understood than admitted, as undertaken, than performed.

It is true, that one of the things demanded of the Ordained by the *Presbytery*, was, *Whether they resolved to con-*

tinue in their duty against all trouble and persecution? But if I be disabled from without by a Law from executing this Function, then does my Duty cease: for as for any other Duty than that of a Parish-Minister, it never came once in my thoughts, by any sudden words, then to engage unto; and a man perhaps may partly remember (as to the import) what his words were. Here is the main Query, Does thy soul and conscience tell thee, Thou art fit to do God service this way? Doest thou believe thou canst? that thou canst do him the best service, and better this way (I speak of using Preaching) than any other? And hast thou a heart for it? Then will I say that I think there lies a necessity on thee (and necessity will find out her way), but not such a necessity however as was on Paul the Apostle: If not, *Esto jam certus* (saith Luther) *& sese agnoscat quicumque se Christianum esse cognoverit, omnes nos æqualitèr esse Sacerdotes, hoc est, eandem in verbo & Sacramento quocunque habere potestatem. Verùm non licere quenquam hac ipsa uti nisi consensu communitatis, aut vocatione majoris. Quantum ergo è Scripturis docemur, cum Ministerium sit id quod nos Sacerdotium vocamus, prorsus non video qua ratione rursus nequeat laicus fieri semel Sacerdos factus, cum à laico nihil differat nisi Ministerio. A Ministerio autem deponi adeo non sit impossibile, ut passim ea etiam celebretur vindicta in culpabiles Sacerdotes, dum aut suspenduntur temporalitèr, aut perpetuo privantur officio suo. Lutheri Captivitas Babylonica. De ordine.*

We have now considered every passage in this Treatise, which seems to be any way material; and must take leave to profess that we are not able to guess what it is that this Author really would have; and we farther believe, that he himself cannot tell us: Nor need we desire the Laws to continue in force any longer, than till the Tender Consciences can agree what to have in the stead of them.

Having

Having this occasion given me, and being thus put upon it as I am, I hope there is no body but will excuse me if they see me more open as to what I purpose here then before. It is fit it should appear no hard matter for me to understand my self what I would have, and where I would pitch, if I may be heard; although I thought it best so to manage my *Proposition* in my first sheets, that if we might have Moderation any way (more narrow) and upon any terms as should best please the Parliament, I should think it well: who may if they please call the *Sober* of our Brethren together about *London* to offer what they would have, and consider of it. For my part, you see how large I am and universal to the quiet of all. I have more particularly proposed the Kings Declaration to open the door for the *Non-conformist Ministers* to enter again into the Vineyard, and an Act against *Pluralities* to find them employment when they are entred. What it shall please God and the Parliament to do with us we must wait. In the mean while I am content my Reverend *Antagonist* is come here to conclude with me, as to the prosecution at least of any farther particulars, who am as willing to come to an end with him. He hath considered, he sayes, every passage of my Book which seems to be any way material. It is well that his words are larger then his performance. But if he speaks indeed as he thinks, I do apprehend he is a man very *singular* in his opinion. There is one passage I will shew him, which were material for him to answer, and he hath said nothing to it. I will recite it the rather, because I find it under that part he sayes is *pittiful*, and so waves it; and also because it is such a passage as must one day be answered for in another manner, and that is to the Lord himself, by those Stewards of his House who have turned out their Fellow-Servants,

and

and eat and drink, and reap the benefit, and not think of his coming. The passage is this, and the Argument I am upon, from Conscience. "Have there not been some, nay
 "many of those Ministers whom you have ejected, serious
 "persons, faithful Labourers, and worthy of the Vineyard?
 "and why have you imposed such conditions to the entrance or continuance of their Ministry, as they cannot
 "yeeld unto without going against their Consciences?
 "Can you say that in these Conditions you have really
 "condescended to them as far as possibly you could, without sinning against yours? And that you have done
 "moreover all that you are able for their Restitution?
 "Why then is your Peace with these men laid upon the
 "approbation and use of those things which in their nature are disputable and unnecessary? The Church is a
 "company of persons professing the belief and practice of
 "those things which Christ hath appointed to Salvation,
 "and when no more can indeed be required unto union
 "than a joyning in the owning and practising all things
 "that are such, why is there any thing that is not necessary to eternal Life made the condition to a man (after trial
 "of his sufficiency and allowance by Orders) of performing his Ministry, any more than of his communion with
 "the Congregation? If this Gentleman would have answered my Book so, as to have been worthy of thanks from Me and his Readers, he should have done thus: In the first place he should have laid down my *Proposition* in the state of it as I gave it. He should have then shewed wherein I am too short, or where too large, or what it was he required. He should next have produced the four heads of my Arguments unto which I expressly reduce my Discourse, and, reading the same throughout, he should gather
 ther

ther the contents, and strength, in the Analysis of the Particulars unto those heads; and then displaying the whole to its due advantage, he should have essayed what he could say to the business. This would have been a work perhaps to his honour, but now hath he run my Book over, as one that would answer me rather by the spartlings of his Pen, then by what he hath wrote; and indeed as one, who seems likely to be set upon it, to write against me, and so being fraught with prejudice and encouragement, must either find matter, or make it for his opposition. *How forcible are right words, but what doth such arguing reprove?*

As for what the Gentleman hath besides, I was thinking of falling upon it as the rest, but when I got hereabouts a Parliament-man (and my courteous Friend) brought me several Papers against Toleration, that I perceive it in vain for me to go about a particular meddling with this man or any other, any farther then they meddle with me, which else will but make my work grow with my labour, and shall come to no end of it. Here is one Paper printed of Votes in Parliament in sixty two, and another of the *Presbyterians* Judgement to the Assembly against forty five, against Toleration, with other the like letters it may be, and things as I know not, that are raked up to possess the Parliament against our Cause, as if nothing were to be given to Time, and Tryal, and Experience, and mature Consultations. The Parliament have indeed in the first place been careful of the concerns of the Government and his Majesty, but they have not left the Grievances of the Nation to oblivion, but to a redress (we suppose) in the fitter season.

Two Books I have here, that are written against that very considered piece entituled, *A Discourse of the Religion*

of England, which is upon the same subject, and came out about the same time (though mine perhaps was at the Press sooner) with my *Proposition*. The one of them (I thank him) hath never a word of me : Yet do I think he hath indeed a great deal less to that Book it self that every word is upon ; I mean it, in regard of his setting of so much the more the worth of him he opposeth. The other Book hath this one passage which concerns me. *It is no great credit for Toleration that Julians practice is proposed for a pattern, by the Author of a Proposition for Peace and Happiness, who to abuse the Age to an inclination of imitating him, calls him wise and brave (though with the allay of cursed and Apostate.) Which is no great wonder, since every Sect commends those of their own Judgement ; and it appears that Author is not acquainted with the History of the Usurper ; for if he had, he must have censured him for a vain and light-headed person, and must have known that the Toleration he granted, and not his contempt of Christians, did them the greatest mischief.* I must confess the Writer of this Discourse, may come fresher from his Book about this matter then I, who am not with my Study, yet do I remember partly, I have read, according as he sayes, that some of the Christian Fathers, or Ecclesiastical Historians, have spoken thus of *Julian*, as well as worse, through prejudice conceived of him for his Apostacy : But I doubt not if I had *Ammianus Marcellinus* by me, (whom he quotes, and who of all men is indeed most likely to know that Emperor) I might shew him fair Cards for the Epithites I give him. I am sure I have observed it in some Author of ingenuity, that those Christian Writers that spoke of *Julian* as he sayes, were to be blamed as weak for such partiality, not doubting but the man (setting his Villany against Christianity aside) was a very

N

excel-

excellent Person, not being of his Sect neither for such a
 free-speaking of him. And indeed what need there more
 witness to the justifying these two Epithites, of wise and
 brave, in the man, then this one action? Was it not a brave
 thing when he might have persecuted all the Christians,
 and some more revengfully that were so justly ready to ex-
 ecrate and curse him, yet as a thing unworthy, he did not
 do it? And was it not as politickly as ever was any thing
 done, when the effect, as this Author cannot but acknow-
 ledge, did shew the same? As for the design it self, which
 I aim at in this signal Example, the Author hath gratified
 me much, while he tells us and proves it, that it was *Toleration*
did the Christians the greatest mischief. What he
 means by the denial, that it was *not contempt of Christians*
 did it, I am to guess, seeing the passage, as it is in my
 Book, gives him little cause for it. That *Julian* did make
 use of this, as one part of his contrivance to work upon
 the Christians, to wit, to let none of them have prefer-
 ments or any countenance from him, unless they would
 come to his Religion, this man who hath read so well a-
 bout the matter, hath not the face, I hope, to deny, for
 so much I suppose he will allow me to understand of the
 Story; and when he tells me it was *Toleration* did the
greatest mischief, there must be some mischief to be sup-
 posed by this carriage of his also, which he may call *con-*
tempt of the Christians, neglect or discouraging of them
 as he please. Here then is that *project* of mine (as my
 proper opposer phrases it) how to deal with these Sects
 and Sectaries. That which they would have by their Acts
 and prosecuting of such, is to break them, and mischief
 them, to that end only, that they may reduce them. But
 the only course to do this, or at least the most effectual (in
 this

this instance) that can be, is Discountenance only and Toleration. The Author hath given up his Cause to me in this example, by his endeavour of a Confutation. For if when the State was Heathen, Christianity it self, which hath so deep a footing for it in the hearts of men, could by this Project receive such waste of her numbers, which encreased alwayes on the other course (these Authors plead for) in the dealings of former Emperors : how much rather may we believe, that when the State is Christian and Protestant, and there is so little footing for Separation in comparison, it should do it much more ?

While this Author is under my hand, there is one Insinuation subtilly put in by him, As if we could not have a Toleration granted, but we must have a standing-Army. I cannot but note this (though I leave the main Book to his proper Adversary), as a saying of ill consequence, that deserves no thanks for him, and is without Reason. If a Prince had a Plot to bring in a company of Sects and Divisions in Religion upon a Politick end (as to destroy that which is predominant), it were a provision not amiss that he had an Army, for fear they should be unruly and not answer his end : but when there are a company of Sects in a Nation already, and Toleration is proposed as a means of their redress, If such Sects have been kept in order when they have been prosecuted by Law and Violence, and so under rage and exasperation, it is a foolish imagination to think that there will be need of an Army to keep them in order, when they are secured and quiet by a Toleration. A Toleration may perhaps incourage some persons (as take off the edge of more) in their private divisions against one another, which will help to outravel them : but as for the Supream Power it self, which gratifies them all in this Li-

be rty of their Conſciences, it will be made ſtrong thereby as to the Publick Spirit, and univerſal Intereſt, both againſt Inſurrection and Invaſion.

• Among theſe Papers, two other ſheets appear, entituled *Mr. Baxters judgment of Conformity*, with a *Reflection* on my *Propoſition*. One would think by the Title that here were ſomething of Mr. *Baxter* againſt me, but when we turn over leaf we find a feigned Letter by ſomebody, to a Gentleman (as he ſayes) of the Houſe of Commons, which Gentleman doubtleſs is no-body : The ſubſtance whereof comes to this, that the man who is the framer hath belike a ſuperlative conceit of his own worth, and fine ſtyle more eſpecially, and he could do great feats againſt us he counts, if he would : but as for my Book it is ſo mean in the ſtyle, and the *Arguments* ſo weak, that he is aſhamed to deal with ſuch an Adverſary. A Superlative pretty-fellow this, eſpecially if I can gueſſe who the man is, that the reputation of my Book (ſo mean as it is) ſhould make him ſwell thus with envy, and burſt forth into Print only to make diſcovery of his Pride and Folly. Let him, if he can, enjoy the conſcience of his deed, but he hath really done me in it a double courteſie ; The one is with my Brethren, who in that paſſage of mine he recites (which is ſpoken of the *Nonconformiſt-Ministers*, and ſo what he ſayes of the *People* is nothing to me) were apt to think I had granted ſo far that they were diſpleaſed with me, but when they ſee Mr. *Baxter* brought by this man out of his Book of Diſputations to yeeld as much as I do (which Book was not unknown to me) it will be I hope ſome allay to their minds in that matter. The other courteſie he hath done me, is with the upright of their own party, who when they ſee how willing ſome *Nonconformiſts* are to go as far as they can unto Submiſſion,

mission, they may be themselves as willing to condescend to us, where we can go no further, in some fair Accommodation.

To return to my proper Adversary. The rest of that Book I have been answering, comes to this mainly; There are *Presbyterians*, and the *Sectaries*. Neither of these must be tolerated.

The *Presbyterians* must not, for their Principles, and for their Practices. These Principles he gathers from the *Scots* in relation to the Scottish Tumults. But what if the *Presbyterians* generally will not own those Principles? and what if some believe them, but keep their faith to themselves, and hurt no-body with it? I answer then, I deny the Principles of the *Presbyterians* to be such, but that they can accommodate with the *Episcopalian* upon the terms of his Majesties Declaration passed into a Law; and that if some of them do hold any tenent that is not tolerable, they do not broach it to the scandal of others, whereby they should deserve to be shut out of communion with their Brethren for it, and consequently that they are not incapable even of Ecclesiastical Toleration. For their Practices, God forbid that I should sin against my conscience to justify all the proceedings of these men in the late times, especially in the framing and imposing the Covenant under those circumstances as they did, with prosecution of those that could not, or would not take it, to the depriving them of their livelihoods, not suffering some of them to teach a School, that needed it. I have not a spirit, or heart to approve any of these things in either party. To have an Oath of that quality, and of that size, an Oath of an ell long or more, so many words to be sworn to! God redeem us from the memory of it. But as for the Argument of this Author and his Fellows (for herein I see they agree

agree together) that therefore this sort of men are not to be tolerated, but they must be done unto, as they did to them, what shall I say to it? O thou Argument! thou art a vile naughty Argument. The Lord rebuke thee. An Argument for a Jew, (An Eye for an Eye, and a Tooth for a Tooth) or an Heathen, for that injuries are not to be recompensed as benefits, we may be instructed by *Maximus Tyrius*. Thou art an Argument, not fit to come into the Mouth or Pen of a Christian Man, much less into the Books of Divines, two or three of them at once to the same purpose. I will advance from hence therefore a contrary Argument which shall so shame these Authors, and the rest of the same inclination (by Gods Grace) as they shall never be able to lift up their hand more against it, and that is this. Sirs! These sort of men did indeed deal hardly and injuriously with you, (God forgive them) and when time was, would give you no Toleration, Therefore must you deal kindly and Christianly (Therefore must you deal otherwise) and tolerate them. You argue, We will not now tolerate them, because they dealt evilly with us. But I argue, Because they did so, therefore must you do it. *Recompence to no man evil for evil. Vengeance is Gods, Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with Good.*

For the Sectaries, they are not to be tolerated because it will be prejudicial to the *State*, and to *Religion*. That is the sum of what they all have; Their Particulars I am not to trace. I answer in general, and in particular. In general, If Toleration were that which brought in our Sects and Schismes amongst us, they would argue well from the inconvenience and prejudice of our divisions against the admittance of Toleration: But when these Sects and

and Divisions are in the Church, together with all the consequences and inconveniences thereof already, and Toleration is it alone which by a way about, must heal them : it is a manifestly perverse mistake in the foundation, thus to argue from the evils of the Disease, against the Remedy. Not as if we thought that the kindness only hereof (which is all belike this Gentleman can think of) should melt them, and so should do it (though that may do some little) but because of the facility (or easiness of having) of that which now they are so eager for, looking upon themselves as restrained from it, will satiate them : and the opposition moreover thereby cooling, as the fire when the fuel is removed, it will go out of it self. In particular, For the *State* first, I have said, and say, that when there are any Sects which are considerable in their rooting and numbers, if they be bandied in a common Interest against the Laws, while they are put in force against them, I think indeed they are dangerous, and we may dread the temptation of occasion : but if they be disbandied into their single Interests by Toleration, there is no more fear of them ; but the Supream Magistrate is become so much stronger, To wit, in the strength of *All* of them for himself, and of *each*, one against another. For Religion then next, I call in hither, what is tendred in that one sheet, I have sent abroad already. Religion is a thing, I account, that can stand on its own bottom. There is the Word of God, and the Internal Conscience. There are the Weapons of our Warfare, which are mighty to the pulling down of every strong hold, and to bring every high thought and imagination into captivity unto the knowledge of Christ ; and these Weapons are Spiritual, and not Carnal. It would have been abundantly sufficient to the Primitive Christians

if

if they might but have had the liberty of their profession. Those Magistrates are Nursing-Fathers that do give us that, and Protection. Truth is strongest, and will overcome all things. See the second Edition of my *Proposition*, p. 101, to p. 107. I am not willing here to say more of this matter.

As for that trite Declamation against all *Innovation*, that the *Beginners do not see to the end, and are usually disappointed by accidents, the diversity of mens inclinations, the dangers thereof unknown*, with shadows of the like nature, it does little move me, who do propose indeed no change of the present Government to be made, but onely what the Kings Declaration put into a Law will do, which hath doubtlesly so considered the Interest of Episcopacy, as in the main lines thereof, that is like to take no harm by it. And whereas there is one difficulty hath possesst this man, that unless it be provided against, the contrivance of Toleration must be *absolutely the most senseless thing in the world*, to wit, if we do not provide against those that do *pretend Conscience, and abuse it* (in one place), for *some may speak lies in hypocrisie* (sayes he, in another). Truly there does need very little care at all to be taken about this matter, (only in every man for himself, who must stand or fall on his own bottom) seeing that part of Toleration which consists of freedom from persecution, is Universal and unlimited by any bounds, but only those of the Interest of State (which will maintain the Kings Supremacy against the Pope, and will secure it self by Laws and Temporal Punishments against all Things and Persons, Civil or Religious, as they have influence on it to do it hurt, for so Religion comes under its Coercive Power, as in other regards under its care), when the other part which consists of

the Kings favour and State-advantages, is particular and limited, that is confined within the bounds and clauses of the Declaration mentioned, even such, or the like as shall seem better, and best to the wisdom and consultation of the Parliament. Let the Church moreover use her Spiritual Weapons, if she please to her utmost, for her self; it may concern her indeed to discern between the Hypocrite and the sincerely deceived, in her Application of Rebukes or Censures; but as for the stress of the difficulty, in regard of Temporal Penalties, it is taken clean away by the stating our Toleration.

Before I go off, there is a business in one of these men to be noted as consonant to the rest, who from the mention of the Donatists, and a little Church Story (which might have been enlarged from *Simon Magus* to *Arrius*, and then from him to our times, through most of the Fathers (such as *Irenaeus* particularly and *Epiphanius*) and Ecclesiastical Writers (since there hath been any story going) endeavours to shew us how the rise of several Sects and Heresies have been from the lusts of men; But these men must not make us believe hereby as if there were no Conscience therefore in any other Party but in theirs onely in this Nation, or that the difference of Judgments amongst us, which lead men into different Parties, have not their Foundation in the fear of God, and consequently require no tenderneſs in our Rulers, and in those Acts which do pass in our Parliaments.

For my part, There are two things I must declare for the discharge of my Conscience, to be the more Principal Causes or Occasions of Separation in our People according to my best apprehension, the one of which these men will not hear of, and the other they have scarce looked

into, to see the bottom of it. I will discharge my Duty by Gods Grace.

The former is, The formality of the Episcopal Party, in their standing upon their Uniformity once established, as their God Almighty, that nothing of it must be parted with, let there be never such serious exceptions, and advices of the prudent, or scruples of the weak. That some things enjoyned are unlawful to be yeelded to, is the opinion of many, and disputable by most: That the Church, and those that impose these things may again remove any or all of them if they see good, it is agreed upon by All beyond any doubt; And why some or any such kind of indifferent matters, when they become grievous, are yet retained, unless it be only for this Reason, that *they have been*, who is not to seek? I profess the humour of cleaving thus much to these Trifles, as *Calvin* (whom my Antagonist hath quoted so powerful in their behalf) does account them to be, *tolerabilis inoptia* (tolerable in regard of the *Submitter* who cannot help them, and trifles in regard of the *Imposer*, that they should not be stood upon so as they are by them) is such a piece of childish grave obstinate something, I know not what to call it, as is scarce to be parallel'd (according to my genius) by any piece of Fanaticism among the Sectaries, considering how they breed so much disturbance, & might be as easily spared no doubt from the House of God, as the Hail-stones from the Hat, and the Water out of the Shoe, when a man comes to his own. I am ashamed, me thinks, when I see some of these very grave eminent and sober men (such as Archbishop *Whitgift* in his time was) to bestow so great travel as they are forced in the maintaining the lawfulness of many of these things, when if they would but endeavour half

so much to have them brought under an equal debate of Parliament, they might have all the objections of their Adversaries, together with the whole strife about these matters, so well answered for them at one bout, as they were never yet so answered in this world. Were I a Bishop, I should stand stiff, I think, for my Revenews, and Singing, and Organs; The one was for my profit, the other for my delight, and raising my Devotions. But as for any thing else, where neither of these were concern'd, if they caught me keeping a stir about them, they might swear I had taken the humour by Contagion. I am persuaded, if it had pleased our Rulers, in former dayes, at the beginning of mens scruples about these matters, to have hearkened to their Brethren, and redressed what might have been, we might have been as happy a People in our Religion as any other perhaps under Heaven: But when this temper hath continued thus from the Reformation in our Land, even to the late Restitution of his Majesty, and must then hold out still, I cannot tell what to say to it, but as it is no wonder when the grave and serious have been unsatisfied in what they have offered, that others who are more weak, should be raising more doubts and offences, and so multiply our divisions: So do I think the cure hereof is to proceed in the same method, that is, By a Composure with the eminent and most sober, others who are apt to do as they do, will come into the same, and the rest hereupon will be following one another as fast as they can to their satisfaction. For, where *Dissentions* have grown from a *Spirit of Contradiction*, a *Toleration* will suffer them to languish in their own fury, and wast for want of opposition. That Person who hath used these words, and is convinced so far as they speak him, may bear as flighting

a countenance as he will, but he cannot, at the heart, condemn what I have written. *Toleration will not remove the Causes of our Division, or hinder its Effects*, is the sum of what is said by this worthy person: But if Toleration will quench the spirit of *Contradiction*, and so the effects thereof cease with it self, then is that which is said, answered; and the Author taken in his own acknowledgment. There is a Spirit in the *Puritan* naturally opposite to these mens formalities: But if there shal be a latitude given in such things, our Division in that regard, and the effects must cease. And what hath this, or any other man, to say why that should not be done? or why the State should be put upon any more Acts, and the People harrassed, rather than such things be left, that are not worth one careful thought of any body what becomes of them. There is one Section I see in this Reverend Person, wherein he speaks up to this, and the sense is to this purpose: *The first Reformers having taken away what was excessive, and retained only what is for decency and discipline, it is not fit they should gratifie so much those that pretend Conscience, lest they seem to give place to the imputation which hath been laid upon their Rites, as Antichristian, and the like, which will draw on a deeper charge of guilt upon their Cause, render them inconstant, and do I cannot tell what hurt to their Authority.* It is well. There are some men I have been told, in very great likance of gray-age, infomuch that whatsoever be the guise of other folks, and how cumbersome soever they become to them, by no means must cut their Beards, but have a Case on nights that they may not disturb the order of them. A venerable humour this undoubtedly! For seeing they have pared away all the hairs already that were superfluous, and there is an *imputation* laid upon them that they are *superstitious*

in the observation (even to the making a kind of Idól) of them, and it were a *reproach to them*, that when their beards are innocent, *decent* and *significant* Beards, they should become *various* in them: Therefore according to that learned, reverend, and worthy Author of the *Discourse of Toleration* (Sect. 14.) it is not *prudent*, it is not *safe*, and it maketh not to their *honour*, to do it.

The latter thing which is the cause of Separation, is a matter of deeper consideration; I cannot name it without some trouble in the reflection, to think how far it reaches and is like to hold to the continuance of this effect. It is this, That the Principles the *Protestant* generally, and our Church hath received and holds, do, I fear me, lead to it. It is well if I cannot say, that the Principles of the *Protestant*, which leads our Church to separate from the *Papist*, did not encline the more Religious (according to their seeming) among us, to separate from it. There is but that one point I will presse, which hath been before in hand to be redressed, and I will take up alone in it; The Church is a number of the Faithful; Truth of Grace or sound Faith and Repentance, makes a man a Member of Christ, or of the mystical Body his Church; and *Profession* hereof makes him a visible Member. This is the common *Protestant* Doctrine in this matter, as those know that understand it. Upon this those persons who are serious in this Doctrine do accordingly require a Profession to the entering Christian Society, or receiving any to be members. That Profession must be such, to make them visible Members, as that if they have what they make profession of, they are, and must be truly Members, or really of the mystical Body of Christ. Upon this Profession then do these men gather from us; They cannot, they dare not accord-

ing

ing to their consciences, do otherwise upon this foundation. What now hath our Church to oppose their practice? Why there is a Profession (she will tell them) and such a profession of no lesse than true saving Repentance and Faith, required by her, of all her Members at Baptism. This now is right according to the Principles of both. But the Infants profession, that it believes and renounces the Flesh and the World, for its admission to Membership and Baptism, does not satisfie their consciences. This in good earnest is all one with them, as if such persons had never made any. What further help have we then? Why there is Confirmation, and we may suppose that all persons baptized in infancy, do or ought then to renew their baptismal Vow and Covenant, which amounts to as high as any Separatists profession, and so are to be acknowledged or confirmed Members, and admitted to the Supper. This again were right to the same Principles in both. But is Confirmation indeed so used by our Bishops? Is it to be proved that this is such an universal Ordinance, and instituted by Christ to that end? Who knows not what difficulties may arise presently? That which sticks with me is, that if there should be a form of Profession for the Confirmed, composed in the strictest terms, That they did unfeignedly take Christ, and repenting of their sins did purpose universal obedience, it would but degenerate into a formality quickly, and every unsensible one would profess so, without scruple; when whosoever did, and were not sincerely converted and regenerated, should but lie openly before the Almighty, which is a thing so averse to me, that I could not choose such a Profession as general to be made by all persons on that account, either to Membership or the Sacrament, or by the Parent as necessary for his Child

Childs Baptism. In which last particular I find I can better bear with our own Liturgy than that which was devised by the *Presbyterian*. For when our Church requires such a Profession in the Child, we may fetch a notable understanding for it from her Catechism to fit that Notion which I would offer for a *healing* at the bottom of this whole *fore*; and that is, to define the Church by a reception of the Christian Doctrine, engagement to the practice which is conditional, and an attending the Ordinances as the means of a mans Conversion as well as Edification, and not by profession of saving Grace and Regeneration. To this purpose do I offer what you have already in these Papers, and what is more fully delivered in two sheets in Latine otherwise, which I shall annex therefore hereunto at the end for their apparent reason, desiring some-body who hath a full understanding of the Notion, and a voluble expression, to set the same forth more copiously, according to the perfect meaning, but with the liberty of words and variety in the explication, only taking this along with him; That when I seem to refuse there to define a visible Member by Profession, let it be understood of such a Profession as I there and here name; for if you will make the owning the Christian Religion, and attending (or in attending) the Ordinances, to be Profession, it is that by which I would define him. And upon that it is, I do take the whole People of the *Jews* to be Holy, the Children of the Kingdom, and separate from other Nations; and so do I take this Nation to be Christian, and that *really*, not *equivocally* in reference to Infidels; though in reference to the mystical Member, some are not to be accounted really so. *Called to be Saints*, to be in English, *ergo* as in *feri* so, admitted Members. And then as our Gathering-

men

men will receive their Members to the Ordinances, who in their hearts and lives (so long as they are Hypocrites) deny Christ, upon the account of Profession they have once required: So will I receive such who are our Members upon the account of (their constant explicit acknowledging our Religion supposed) having their faces toward, or coming now to the means for the saving Grace of Almighty God, if they have it not yet already. Let any expresse this (and what I have in the Latin mentioned) more aptly; and if it will not be received, I shall be glad to hear any thing else more tight and able to do our work. In the mean time, suppose we a serious and judicious Person, upon the received Notion of the Church as visible by Profession, does gather a People, to which his Conscience, he sayes, does inforce him; I will demand of any of the learned Sons of our Church that hath a Christian heart, how they can plead for Laws, and the execution of them, against such a one onely for pursuing those Principles, which themselves own, into practice, and cleaving close to them, when they deviate from them? It is not only unchristian, but inhumane, and contrary to all reason and light, to vex, molest and torment a man for following the Rule that is set him, when our selves shall acknowledge that Rule or Principle, but in our practice not observe it? If the Visible Church be defined by Profession, and such as is no lesse than of a saving Faith or Grace, that those who have what they professe, must truly and effectually be in Christ; how shall we find fault with these men, because they will not own that to be a Church, where there is no such Profession? Let some of these learned men, who are so hot against Indulgence toward their Brethren, say something to this, if they can, to purpose; If they cannot, let them

them be convinced and assured from hence that some, and many, and the most, that enter upon, or continue a different way of Church-society from us, do do it upon the account of Conscience, and if we will persecute them for Righteousnesse and Conscience-sake, we have reason to take heed lest we persecute Christ himself, and his way, and kick against pricks. What the Independent will say for his gathering to Membership, the Anabaptist will enhance for their entring them more orderly by Baptism, and bear as hard on that score upon them, as they do upon us. For my part, if what I have offered would go, I know what to say; but whether it will or it will not, I must needs acknowledge with conviction, that I do perceive so much more reason for Toleration upon this account, than most be aware of, that I would not be the man to write against it as these do, for all they shall get by it. It is fit men should understand the ground of *Separation*, before they write against Toleration, and then perhaps they would do it with more sense of humane weaknesse toward their Brethren, being convinced in themselves first of it.

It is a passage commendable in that Answerer of the *Discourse about Religion*, who speaks of the Author with the respectful Appellation of a sober Person, and of *such parts as deserves a better Subject than that he hath undertaken*. It is well to give a man some acknowledgement for his excellent labours, but if he had turned the Tables with him as to the Subject, he should have rob'd him of the best thing for which he is praise-worthy. For as for our Adversaries methinks I feel some fear upon their hearts, through the guilt and conscioufnesse of the Subject on the contrary they have chosen, which makes them hide their names for all they are uppermost, seeing in the bottom of it, it is

P

Per-

Persecution only of innocent People, the faithful Servants of Christ and their Brethren, they are pleading for ; when
 • I, and this worthy Partner who hath done so well, are pleading the Cause of our Lord, who hath commanded *Meekness, Love, Gentleness, Bowels of Mercy and Kindness, Forbearance, Long-suffering and Goodness*, for Agreement and Good will, against those Persons who are for Irreconciliation, Hatred, Detestation, Laws, and Violence, and Ejection. Is this the Spirit of Christianity, and can they please themselves in this? Are we indeed to do to others, as we would have them do to us? How inexcusable then are they rendred, who after they have sufficiently reviled, as well as justly censured the proceeding of former times, do now the same things which they have judged? It is in vain to go to bring up a prejudice upon Toleration, when *Forbearance of one another* in its proper nature, is a Christian Virtue. The bearing with a difference of Judgment in others, which is the Root of all here, hath so many grounds for it in humane Nature, Reason and Religion, that a man had need of some strong proofs for Persecution, that undertakes to write against it. But when in the Old Testament there are but two or three places about the Idolater, false-Prophet, and Seducer to Idolatry, and something the like which might be *Capital*, I account (in my Sheet mentioned) upon a Judicial Plea, The *Jews* being under a *Theocracy* in receiving their Laws, it was (I say there) a kind of Treason against their proper King ; when in the New Testament there is not a Text to countenance any thing of this nature (I mean the persecuting a man for *Error*) by the *Temporal* Sword, but by the Application of the *Spiritual*, only the Word of God ; when if we look over two or three hundred years of the Primitive Fathers,

we shall have their consent to run thus, *Withdraw from them, Avoid them*, & μὲν χεῖρ ῥύπτειν ἀντὶς καὶ διαώκειν, καθὼς ταῖς ἑθνεῖς, but not *beat* or *persecute* them, as the Heathens do ; When the Plea for all the Persecutions that were in those cruel dayes before *Constantine*, were the same that these men father now upon us, that these Sects are pestiferous to the State, and to the Religion of their Gods, and therefore *Tollite impios, & Christianos ad Leones* ; When the fruits of Toleration toward all Sects under *Jovian* and *Gratian* wrought more kindly, than the rigor of *Maximus* and the like Emperors ; When we have the eminent example of *Theodosius* out of *Bodin*, in his dealing toward the *Arrians* ; When the bloody doings of the *Papists* toward the *Protestants* here and beyond the Seas, and the experience of some late tryals on the *Anabaptists*, *Quakers* and others, do witness to this Truth, That to go to *suppress an Opinion by Force* is not only *for the most part a fruitless* but an unlucky *attempt*, being the means ordinarily to propagate it ; I say, that these and the like things considered, those that will plead this cause against Toleration, shall have within a little while as little heart to it, as the men of *Gideon's City* had against him when they were cooled. If Uniformity be a God, let him plead for himself, seeing one hath cast down his *Altar*.

It is not the *Inconveniencies* they pretend to be in Toleration, let them bring as many as they can, that is to be compared with the evil that is in Persecution it self, which they must plead for, who plead against this, That vile, irrational, barbarous, brutish way of working upon the spirits of men which are free and uncontrolable, by corporal afflictions. Is there any evil in cruelty, inhumanity, oppression, in unmercifulness and doing hurt to our Neighbour,

bour, the prejudicing his Estate, imprisoning his Person,
 grieving his Family, interrupting his Vocation? and what
 if we proceed to Banishment, which to some is worse than
 Death? If this be evil, Does not this evil become exceed-
 ing evil, when the Persons thus used are honest men, peace-
 able in their behaviour, and harmless in their lives? nay,
 when they fear God, and make a conscience of their ways,
 and suffer all this meerly for Conscience-sake? Is there no
 evil in disturbing and hindring the Service of God in these
 mens assembling themselves for his Worship, when accord-
 ing to their light they cannot assemble otherways? Is there
 no evil in the troubling Justices and Officers, and bringing
 them many times into such perplexities they cannot tell
 what to do in them? There are many worthy generous
 catholick-spirited, as tender-hearted Gentlemen in Office,
 whose natures are averse to put such Laws in execution,
 when a poor silly Neighbour must be sent to prison, and
 his Family have not bread in the mean time. They cannot
 abide such doings and yet for the Law-sake are brought
 into it. Nay, what if so much Light break into some sensible
 minds, as that this appears to them a thing against Equity
 and Righteousness, Christianity and the Rule of the Go-
 spel, wherein Gentleness is required, and not such deal-
 ings of its Professors; and hereupon they conclude that
 their duty to God supersedes their obligation to the Laws:
 and yet for fear perhaps of being accounted one that fa-
 vours these men, or displeasing the present Powers or some
 other, or for ingratiating a mans self, one does imbrue his
 hands in the execution of these Acts, which when he hath
 reflected upon, he is ready to wish perhaps a thousand times
 he had gone thither himself whither he sent the last poor
 men, rather than he had done it? Is there no evil think
 you

you in this? And what if any one of these thus dealt with, through Terror, or lothness to go to Prison, and the Perswasion of others, be drawn in to do something imposed against his Conscience, to free himself, and so goes home with a wound in his Soul, and an Arrow through his Liver, and knows not when he shall recover his peace again: or else if he hath no regret, it may be, that together with his Way, he hath forsaken also his Conscience, and so being hardned to the neglect of his duty, he falls into perdition? And what think you now, can you produce me worser evils in Toleration, that outballance these, which the *want* of Toleration involves us in? or is there indeed any such peerless good in Uniformity, with all its advantages, that does countervail these evils, that it should be desired? When I shall apprehend any evil in our Cause, that is so damn'd an evil, as the murdering the soul of him that suffers not: or if he do suffer, of him that causeth him to suffer, then will we change Subjects with these Authors; and in the mean time must take heed how we *affirm* that so much *evil* as here is, may be *done* for any *good* they can dream to *come of it*, lest our *condemnation be just*.

There are two things I perceive in the upshot that people do confound and put together, which for want of dividing one from another, clouds their apprehensions. They are these, *Peace* and *Uniformity*, and our *Divisions* and *Toleration*. When these men have spoken against Dissention in Religion, that it arises from our Corruptions, and the consequences to be lamentable, they think then they have sufficiently confuted *Toleration*: and when they have commended Union and Peace, and told us how happy we should be if we were of *one way* and *one mind*: with such discourses, they think they have established *Uniformity*.

formity. But alas ! These things truly have no such affinity, but the contrary do stand one with another. The evil of *Separation* may make us so much the more in dislike with *Uniformity*, and the good of *Concord* should bring us the more in love with *Toleration*. For thus indeed are these things to be disposed as Causes and Effects one towards another. I am a man according to my Principles that must believe Separation from the Church to be Schism, and that we ought to joyn in Common-Prayer and Communion, and consequently that all the evil which may be spoken of *Schism, in genere*, may be spoken against *Separation*; What can any of those say more ? But when I have said this, I do not think I have said a word for all this against *Toleration*, seeing Schism, Error, Heresie, and the like, are things to be persecuted by the Word of God, by Argument, by Reason, by Reproofs, Convictions, Censures, but they are not to be persecuted by the Temporal Sword, which hath neither Authority over, nor Power with, the *Inner-man*, nor is there any such Rules for Christians from our Lord. Again I am one who have been, and am still, in all I have written, for nothing but for Peace and Union, nay for subjection and obedience to our Superiors for that end, in the things that they command, so far as we are able to yeeld to them in Conscience ; and yet do I, and must I, bear my witnesse to this Generation, to the Parliament, and the Nation, that there is so much *Evil* in the effects of Uniformity as it is now enjoyned, that I must call aloud for a redresse as to the *Imposition* (or as to the part of the Imposer), while I am ready to plead still so far as I can for our *Submission*. When *Joseph*, I remember, brought his Sons to his Father, he placed the eldest to his *right* hand, and the younger to his *left* : but old *Jacob* being guided by a
higher

higher appointment, crosses his arms, and laying his *left* hand on *Manasseh*, he put his *right* on the head of *Ephraim*, who was to inherit the chief *Blessing*. These Persons who have been pleased to make us their Adversaries in this Subject, have been, as it were, tending *Concord* and *Peace* to the hand of *Uniformity* to bless them, and they would ascribe, or bring our *Divisions* to the hand of *Toleration*. His Majesty now, and the Parliament, shall represent to us good *Jacob*, unto whom we are coming on all sides for the blessing they shall please to give us. What God may do upon their hearts I know not, but when they have considered of things according to his Will (who hath given us our Rules, and over-rules us in them), they shall not be destitute, we hope, of that direction, to cross these Arms of *Uniformity* and *Toleration*, and when our *Divisions* do rightly meet with that of the *former*, which (the Consciencious being not able to submit unto) is indeed the Father of them: the *hand* of the *latter* may be stretched forth unto *Peace* and *Concord*, *Love* and *Unity* (in heart and good will, if not in judgment and way), which saying to them *Ye are mine*, the *Blessing* of God may be poured down in a fuller happiness, then yet hath been, to the People in their Parliament, and to the King in his People. Then the old men which stood before Solomon his father spake to Rehoboam, saying, *If thou be kind to this People, and please them, and speak good words to them, they will be thy servants for ever.*

F I N I S.

The Printer to the Reader.

Let not the English Reader be afrighted with these two Latin sheets at the end, for they are no part of the Book, but that it is complete without them. The Precursory sheet the Author cites, is annexed to the second Edition of the Proposition.

Pray mend these Errata.

Page 10, line 22. for Consciences read Consciencious. p. 17, l. 9. & p. 23, l. 11. mend the points. p. 30, l. 10. for *consedet* r. *concedit*. p. *ibid.* l. 27. add *nam*, *quam non alio*. p. 43 l. 11. add *flows*. p. 44. l. 24. for impossible r. unpassable. p. 74. for must not do, r. must do. p. 57. l. 8. for undoe r. do on. In the Latin there is *inficius* for *inficias*, and other literal faults.

There is yet one whole Paragraph left out, wheresoever it must come in. It is this. There are instances no doubt in Story, that are, or might be, brought to confirm our purpose: And some Essay there is to the contrary. The Donatists we are told did encrease under Julian, and our Sects under Cromwel by Toleration. I answer, If Julian had been a Christian, and used that design only against the Sects, as he did against Christianity, the World would have seen of what force it had been to have reduced them to Orthodoxy, but being a Heathen, this encrease of the Sects for a crumbling of Christianity as he designed, doth but shew the greater depth and weight of his contrivance. In like manner, if Cromwel had designed to unite the Sober Godly with the Episcopal Party, and favoured onely those that would come into Union, we should have seen what effects Liberty of Conscience might have had: But when his Interest was otherwise, and there is the one half of our Project (the first and chief part, or half of it) wanting, nay converted against us, it is no wonder if we saw an effect to the contrary. But if it shall please God that this whole contrivance be brought into practice by our Rightful Sovereign, (who onely is fit for an exploit so worthy) as to both the parts of it, to wit, in accommodating the Sober, whole Principles are capable of Concord, casting all the State-Favour and Emoluments into that Scale: and in letting others alone then to themselves to come of it, as their minds serve without persecuting any to enflame them, and without Emolument to encourage them (Let any of these Learned men be but able to defend our Church as distributed into Parochial mixed Assemblies, to be true visible Churches; and let those of our Brethren who come into this Latitude, be sure to lead their lives, so, that they can but out-live the Sectary,) and if this doth not make some other work with the minds of men, then what hath yet been done by Force and Rigor, I will be content to be held for a *Micah*, and take my lot according to the issue.

More Errata. Page 94. l. 3. r. then they did before. p. 96. l. 21. for again, r. in forty five. p. 106. l. 18. r. *tolerabiles ineptias*. p. 108. l. 16. for this r. that.

Reverendis

Reverendis, pietate & eruditione præstantibus, Ecclesiæ
Anglicanæ Ministris, præcipuè verò iis ad quos hæc
potissimum spectant, Patribus, Fratribus, & Com-
militonibus, sub Christo Duce merentibus,
longè charissimis, salutem plurimam.

AD exoptatam toties, & ab omnibus exoptandam, Ec-
clesiæ nostræ felicitatem, ingenerandam, & illa-
sam conservandam (salvo aliorum iudicio) duo qui-
dem apprimè utilia, & maximè accommodata, fore existi-
mo; modò unum à nobis solertè inquire, alterum à Supe-
rioribus pergratè impetrari, eorundemque benignitate &
mandato, in effectum tandem deduci possit. Hoc est, si
præter receptam Ecclesiæ visibilis notionem, aliam non a-
deò strictam, tantæ verò latitudinis, indagare possimus, ut
unionis Ecclesiasticæ sit fundamentum: deindè si magis
sobrii qui notionem istam concoquere, & parochiales no-
stras (quas vocant) Ecclesias ferre possunt, ad mutuam inter
Presbyterum & Episcopum concordiam componendam, po-
tius quàm à causâ alicujus partis stare, se totos & ex animo
applicarent.

Inter arduas, acerrimas, & calidissimas nuperarum & præ-
sentium (proh dolor!) contentionum nostrarum disceptio-
nes & controversias, ancipiti *Marte* utrinque agitas, non
minima lis fuit, de subiectâ fæderis externi materiâ sive de
verâ Ecclesiæ visibilis notione; quæ prout in usu & in more
recepta, adeò arcta & angusta est, ut nonnullis rem contro-
versam altius ruminantibus, & ad rationis normam accuratè
exigentibus, dubitandi ansam dederit, an Ecclesiæ quæ
appellant Nationales, sint verè Ecclesiæ, & Patrocinio
A dignæ;

dignæ; in quibus scilicet, omnes, quemadmodum inter Judeos, quotquot è parentibus Christianis nati, fidei Christianæ per Baptisma initiantur, Tempa frequentant, confessionibus interfunt, pro veris & genuinis habentur membris.

Theologi nostri communiter Ecclesiam per fidelium, sive renatorum ex naturæ statu ad statum gratiæ evocatorum, cætum definiunt; Visibilem verò ab istius renascentiæ (sive salvificæ fidei & pænitentiae) *Professione* denominant. Hanc Professionem *Congregationales*, ambabus (quod aiunt) ulnis amplectuntur, & in præsidium sibi substruunt, dum sine tali, quæ indicio sit hominem salvificâ gratia imbutum esse, pro membro neminem admittunt. Professio non propter se requiritur, sed propter professorem ipsum, ut quis, & qualis ipse sit, nobis innotescat, & dum professio ejusmodi, scilicet nullius inferioris, sed verè renatæ fidei (sive gratiæ,) à Theologis nostris undiq; comprobatur, illi principiis suis adhærere, & seridè rem agere videntur, cum in quantum possunt, hoc prospiciunt, ut illi omnes quos in gregem suum recipiunt (usq; quo saltem Ecclesiæ judicium extendi possit) tales reapse sint, quales se esse profitentur; cum nos qui professionem talem æque ac illi prætendimus, & propugnamus, in principiis nostris tergiversari, vel saltem remissiores quam illa postulant nos gerimus, dum promiscuè illos in gremium Ecclesiæ acceptamus, qui neq; professionem omnino unquam formalitèr ediderunt, nisi per susceptores in Baptismo, aut ullâ probabili conjecturâ, tali quæ requiritur professioni consentaneos vitâ & moribus se indicant. Quanto igitur causæ nostræ prejudicio, hic cum fratribus nostris in hanc arenam, veluti in propriam suam aream, descendimus, facile apparet, ubi si victos nos esse non fateamur aut herbam demus, haud fortasse prudentiæ nostræ & fortioribus rationibus, sed omnia potius consuetudini,

tudini, opinioni, & ut cum Poeta loquar, *defendenti numero* accepta referenda videntur.

Observandum est igitur, & aqua animi lance nobis perpendendum, quod quocunque Apostoli se contulerunt, Evangelium eos prædicasse, & quosdam ibidem loci credidisse, sive sermonem eorum recepisse, in Actis legimus, & ita institutis divinis se subjectasse (scilicet baptizabantur, in doctrinâ istâ, communicatione, panis fractione, & precibus perseverabant) & ex hâc materiâ, sive ex iis in unum cætum hoc modo coeuntibus, conflata & constituta est Ecclesia. Simon *verò & ipse credidit, & Baptizatus perdurabat apud Philippum.* Unde pacè fratrum meorum, hoc colligerem. Doctrinæ scilicet Evangelicæ exoscultationem, in oppositione ad quasque alias Religiones, & sui subjectationem institutis divinis (sive cultus, sive disciplinæ) in loco quo quis vivit usurpatis, ut mediis ad gratiam salvificam, si eâ adhuc se destitutum sentiat obtinendam, esse id (scilicet unicam ad hoc prærequisitam conditionem) quod membrum constituit, sive ad receptionem alicujus in Ecclesiam sufficit. *Qui institutus ex Legis auditu in Lege acquiescit extrinsecus* Judæus est, teste Apostolo. *Rom. 2. Tu credis unum esse Deum, bene facis,* dicit *Jacobus,* de iis qui titulo tenus etiani, duntaxat Christiani erant. Quid ni igitur, sola fides assensus, sive historica, cum externo Dei cultu juncta, visibilem, sive Judæum, sive Christianum efficeret?

Verum est fateor quod Scriptura dum loquitur de membris alicujus Ecclesiæ in genere, prout liquet in Epistolis *Pauli* ad Corinthios (quos inter, nonnulli ad vitia proclives, turpem agebant vitam) cum fideles appellat, aliis etiam titulis omnibus insignit, & ea cumulatè illis attribuit, qualia reratis tantum competunt. Nulla tamen inde emergit consequentia, hoc necesse esse ab illorum professione se tales esse (quasi sui ipsorum præcones fierent Christiani)

oriri, sed hinc potius sive ab hoc prius ostenso, quod hujus rei caput, commodius statui mihi videtur. Quid? quod nihil omnino sanè impedit, quin Ecclesiæ Charitatis judicium à parte potiori totum denominans, professioni alicujus prægrediatur, & dum quispiam mediis ad salutem ducentibus utatur, & in viâ ejus, pede quo capit, pergit, meliora & majora de illo speret & canat, quam de se ipsemet de prædicare, vel potest, vel audet.

Membrum visibile nihil aliud est secundum communem Theologorum conceptum (si rectè calleas) quam pro *Christiano*, sive pro membro reputari, vel in foro aut æstimatione hominum, membrum haberi; Et dum ipse formalis rei hujusce ratio, reverâ in nostrâ æstimatione humanâ, solummodo consistit, si illi qui *Congregationalium* vestigia premunt, neminem pro membro habere velint, apud eos, nisi talem professionem quâ salvificæ gratiæ specimen illis præbeatur, edat; Et nos aliquem pro Christiano aut membro reputare, qui symbolo Apostolicæ Doctrinæ suam dederit assensum, parati sumus, quid obstat, quin totum hoc negotium in Ecclesiæ potestate situm sit, statuere omnino de eo, prout maxime rationibus ejus conducit; ita ut privatus quisque sive minister sive alius, ejusdem judicio, potius quam cujusdam hominis de seipso testimonium perhibentis professione acquiesceret? Immo quum ab Ecclesiâ non assensus solum requiritur, sed etiam publica cultus divini frequentatio & disciplinæ Ecclesiasticæ (quæcunq; extat) submissio, quâ, si turpi vitâ offendiculum, aliqui bonis præbeant, & indignos tali æstimatione se ostendant, ejici ipsos ex statu illo, sive excommunicari, consentiunt: Cui damno quæso fuerit, charitatem suam (quæ omnia credit, omnia sperat) laxare quantum fieri potest? Et cui nocumento promiscuè omnibus (nondum excommunicatis) libertatem & jus ad externis divini cultus institutis utendum concedere, prout
media

media sunt, ad conditionem fœderis acquirendam, dum nos etiam non minus quam illi, ad fœderis beneficia & salutem obtinendam, conditionem ipsam (scilicet veræ justificantis fidei & resipiscentiæ) æque requisitam & necessariam stutimus & inculcamus.

Quod ad hanc professionem attinet quæ ad membrorum in Ecclesiam receptionem, eorumq; liberum ad Sacramenta accessum, adeo necessaria decantatur (si ad investigandam veritatem animi cogitata enunciare liceat) hoc tantum ipse reperio, eos qui à *Johanne* baptizati sunt, confessos fuisse peccata sua, & Eunuchum à *Philippo* baptizatum, fidem suam, nempe Christum esse Dei Filium, asseruisse, hoc est, fidem assensus sive historicam, & professionem aliam ad hanc rem accommodatiorem, ab ullo ad incorporationem (ut ita loquar) ejus in Ecclesiam, requisitam esse in Evangelio non memini. Verum quidem est sub veteri Testamento, cum primum *Israeli* Deus Legem tradidit, totum eorum cætum legimus à *Jehova* stipulatum esse sponsonem, fore sibi Deum, tum ut ambulent in viis ejus: verum sponsio hæc & pro se & pro liberis (*Deut.* 19. 25.) sufficiebat, adeo ut nulla alia professio, ad inscriptionem eorum in statum istius Ecclesiæ injecta legitur, in suis generationibus. Nihil moror bonos illorum Reges & Prepositos, identidem ad renovandum fœdus, populum generaliter compulisse, cum per idolatriam defecerunt à Deo suo, aut cum emergens aliqua occasio hoc postulabat. Sed renovationem talem ad constituenda Ecclesiæ membra, & ad Sacramentorum suorum usum, nusquam requisitam esse, loca ista *Gal.* 2. 15. *Ro.* 3. 1. *Ex.* 16. 20. & similia, ubi *Israelitas*, *Judæos*, nati esse, et priv legia externa inde fluxisse, satis testantur.

Et hic quidem termini ipsi *visibilis* & *invisibilis*, ab hominibus excogitati, & Ecclesiæ applicati, præsertim prout istud ipsum Apostoli (*Ro.* 2.) Judæum distinguentis, in illū
qui

qui in propatulo, & qui in occulto Judeus est, referant, non parum opinioni huic meae fidem facere videntur. Quicquid in membro aliquo *visum*, certum & apparens, dici potest, nihil aliud est, quam quod iste Religionem Christianam, illius instituta publice observando istiusq; disciplinae se morigerum praestando, amplectitur; Et quod ad gratiam ejus corde latentem attinet, ejusdem professio verbalis, *credibilem* illam quidem, sed *visibilem* nullo pacto proprie loquendo reddere potest. Porro, sententiam hanc Parabola illa Evangelica de tritico & zizaniis dilucidat plurimum. Narrant Patrifamilias servuli tritico immista esse zizania; Sciunt, oculis cernunt, pro certo habent, esse zizania. Quemlibet igitur hominum quotquot vivunt appello sciscitorque qui potest quispiam visibile esse Ecclesiae membrum idemq; eodem tempore apparens zizanium? *Et apparuerunt etiam zizania.* Secundum communem nostrorum Theologorum de hac re praedictum sensum hoc quidem prorsus *observatum* esse teneo. A professione scilicet verè renatae gratiae, in numerum regeneratorum (prout fert eorum sententia) unusquisque ascribendus est, hoc est pro regenerato existimandus sive censendus; Et existimatione aliorum regenerari ac visibiliter renatum, sive membrum visibile esse eodè recidit. Hoc verò in loco, homo qui zizanium dicitur, aperte se prodit esse zizanium, & proinde in aliorum existimatione nihil minus quam regenerati nomen sibi asciscit; Unde nihil dilucidius consequi potest, quam zizania *visibilia* membra non esse censenda, cujusdam professionis ergo, à quâ tritici nomen fortirentur, sed reverà quia in agro una cum tritico nascuntur & concrescunt, hoc est, quia divina instituta, precès scilicet publicas, conciones, sacramenta, unâ cum aliis religionem nostram amplexantibus, attendunt & exosculantur, immò etiam ut mediis à Deo illis ad salutem adipiscendam concessis, utuntur. Hoc equidem illud

est quod de ipsis palam fit, et si aliter visibiliter, zizania, quam plurimis forsitan Dei servis innotescunt.

Neque silentio etiam prætereundi sunt termini isti saluatoris ipsius nostri, hæc spectantes qui commodissimè omnium nobis inserviunt, cum distinctione illa vocatorum & electorum, idem hoc depingit. *Multum quidem sunt vocati pauci vero electi; Mat. 22. 14.* Per vocatorum vocabulum illos denotat (ut ex textu patet) qui convivio interfuerunt (sive cum, sive absq; veste nuptiali) hos ab aliis discriminans qui extranei ab Apostolo vocantur, *1 Cor. 5. 12, Eph. 2. 12.* & ita à receptione Evangelii eos invitantis, & institutis ejus sui ipsius deditione (quod forsitan ista phrasia convivias fieri, sibi vult) neutiquam verò ex professione gratiæ (sive nuptialis vestis) definiendi sunt.

Quid quaeso fratres, num tota moles populi *Israelitici* quatenus populus Dei, circumcissus, & fædere inito factus peculiaris, in verè renatorum catalogum asciti fuerunt, vel asciti reputabantur? Quis fit igitur ut clamat aliquando Propheta, *Omnes esse in corde incircumcisos*? Quis fit ut promissum illud, *Ego circumcidam cor tuum, & cor seminis tui*, ad *Israelitas* pertineret fæderatos? Immo, quis fit ut novi fæderis ipsius palmaria quædam promissio sit, *Leges meas cordi eorum inscribam*, si nulli intra fæderis terminos sint admittendi nisi tales, qui illam legem jam corde inscriptam habere censentur? Ecclesia igitur (prout mihi maximè videtur) assimilanda est Scholæ cuidam, in hoc à Deo instituta, ut introducerentur quamplurimi ibi convertendi, potius quàm corporationi, sive sodalitiò, eorum solum qui jam sunt conversi, aut renati. Et quod ad fædus attinet cui sese obligant cum huic initientur, quam commodè fieri posset, si quod ego sentio potissimum, expromere liceat, facile videamus. Videntur mihi quidem Theologi cum Dei fædere (licet sine injuriâ aut opprobrio) hic agere, perindè

ac *Hanun* cum *Davidis* servis qui præcidit vestes eorum per
medium, dum dimidiatam ejus partem, promissoriam scilicet,
unicè nobis proponunt, & partem alteram, com-
minatoriam silentio obruunt altissimo: Quod si totum
ejus quod nobis promulgatum est, utrisque partibus, tam
comminatione quam promissione comprehensum, ritè per-
pendamus, quantum ad rem nostram momenti habeat,
haud dictu opus est. Eadem scriptura quæ nobis annuntiat,
Qui credit salvabitur, annuntiat etiam *qui non credit dam-
nabitur: nisi respiscatis omnes peribitis*. Et sicut quibusdam
salus annuntiatur, ita & quibusdam *judicium*, ex *Pauli Evan-
gelio*, *Ro. 2. 16.* Cum omnibus è Lege recitatis maledictis,
Deut. 27. dicendum erat Israelitis, *Amen*, Nonne illud ani-
marum iidem fæderi astrictio fuit, ac cum benedictiones
morem gerentibus illis sunt promissæ? *Deut. 19. 14.* cum
19. Deut. 30. 19. &c. Et quam alia in illa *78 Amen* repe-
titione excogitari potest fides, præter illam assensus? Sicut
Adamus dum in statu integritatis, & propter illam, sub vita
remansit, vel tum quoad maledictionem conditionalem,
five positis conditionibus denuntiata, Dei erat fæderatus,
adeò ut pacti illius initi hæc pars fuerit, ut si ex vetito fructu
comederet illi morieretur: Ita homo in statu naturæ &
peccati, & propter illud sub morte adhuc constitutus Dei
fæderatus esse potest, quoad benedictionem conditione
posita promissam, quòd si credat & resipiscat, salvus fiet.
Atq; ut nulla alia præter fidem assensus, *Adamo*, quæ com-
minationi illi credidit, unde ad fructum vetitum devitan-
dum cautus redderetur, & ad pactum illud (quoad commi-
nationis partem) cum Deo feriendum, adesse, potuit: Ita
fides assensus quæ Dei promissis credit homo, utpote ve-
rissimis, unde ad mediis omnibus quibus eorum compo-
sitionem incitatur, ad ineundum jam fœdus (quoad
promissionis partem) etiam sufficit. Ad obedientiam polli-
cendum

cendum quid nō valeret fides solum historica, pro certo se aliter damnatum fore homini suggerens, cum ad quod promissum est inviolatè præstandum, nihil valeat, nisi ipsa salvifica Dei gratia? Adeo ut aliud prorsus sit sædus ferire, & longè aliud sædus percussus servare. *Ps. 78. 10.* Foedere illo se devinxit *Adamus*, quod maledictionem complectebatur, priusquam illi, ulla se ex parte reddidit obnoxium.

Adolescentes recens in Academicorum numerum cooptati, ad iurandum quod vocant matriculationis adducuntur, se statuta Academiae esse præstituros; Subit mihi memoria dicti illorum dicentium, Sacramentum illud *pænale* esse, adeo ut licet in leges pecces, non tamen infimulandus perjurii, si pœnam à legibus intentatam exequaris. Tali sane aliquâ interpretatione (quantum ego ratione assequi possum) oportet nos publicam illam nostram coram Ecclesia sponfionem dignari, quâ nos huc adigimur ex pactione factâ, nempe conditiones latas præstituros esse, eodem animo scilicet, quo beneficiis inde manantibus nos fruituros esse speramus, nec inclementius nos tractari musfitabimus, si debitum, promissis violatis, supplicium luamus. Eò res redit; Obligatio est quadam, nomine pœnæ; sub multâ pactio; conditionata promissio; unde quo modo, illis, qui conditionem adhuc nondum assecuti sunt, liceat tamen eidem se devincire, & irreginitus Dei foederatus fieri, luculenter patet, & difficultas omnis expedita est. Quâ enim aliâ mente quæso, à Deo saltem approbatâ, potuit universus populus *Israel* sanctissimâ restipulatione illâ profiteri, *Omnia hæc verba quæ dixit Jehova faciemus*, cum plerique eorum ob pervicacem animum in deserto ceciderunt? Quo etiam alio sensu populum istum, icto foedere, alloquitur *Moses*? *Hodie vobis vitam & mortem proposui, benedictionem & maledictionem, quare vitam elige, ut vivas tu cum semine tuo.* Inspice Lector ingeniose, *Deut. 11. 26, 27, 28, 29.* &

B

ejusmodi

eiusmodi quamplurima loca, & quantum hæc nostrâ referunt, accurate tecum perpende; & si unicum hoc tandem subiungam, ne gravare, viz. impossibile quidem esse, inquispiam credat Evangelio, vel vera solum esse illa quæ nobis annunciat, quin comminationi Dei ad futuram iram devitandam (*Mat. 3. 7.*) astrictus teneatur, & eâ saltem ratione, à mundo prorsus infideli, & ab alienatis omnino à fœdere & statu *Israelis*, contra-distingatur.

Inficius ire non possumus, in forma Baptismi ab Ecclesiâ nostrâ institutâ, ab antiquis Patribus accepta, & *Collectis* illorum ex Ethnicis, membris adultis, potius quam nostris *natu membris* (aut naturâ Christianis, *Gal. 2. 15.*) accommodatâ, professionē requiri ab omnibus baptizandis adeo intensam, ut nihil supra; Verùm ut vix subit intellectum quommodò talis professio, Infantis nomine, fieri queat; ita quibus Lyrurgiam nostram recognoscendi demandata est potestas, ausi fiat vel pilum latum ab antiquâ consuetudine (quæ aliquando vetustas erroris est) discedere, & in locum istorum verborum actualitèr prolatorum, *Credo*, abrenuncio, alia substituere, memet obligo, pollicior, vel similia (secundùm ipsissimum Catechismi verbum *Tria mea nomine compromissor pollicitus est*) interpretatione ad normam mei sensus factâ, & quædam alia verba hic & illic occurrentia permutare, quæ externa Ecclesiæ privilegia tanquam ad vere sanctificatos tantum pertinentia, nimis in arctum videtur compingere, huiusmodi forsan concilium plus conferret ad futuram Ecclesiæ pacem adversus Seperatistarum phalanges, stabiliendam, quam si recognoscentis stylum, multi alii ejusdem in Liturgiâ loci, etiam paterentur; id quod ad presentes fratrum nostrorum animos sedandos, & ipsa, æquitasque Christiana, & Religionis quidem communis salus, postulare quodammodo videtur.

Nullus dubito quin si publicâ authoritate, mandetur po
pulo

pulo professio quidem adeò intensa, quàm intensior excogitari vix possit; ad membrorum confederationem & usum institutorum divini cultus in parochiis singulis instituta, ii præcipuè qui moribus magis distincti, & formâ tenus duntaxat Christiani sunt, sine minimo conscientiae gravamine, palam profiteri, in proprio suo nomine, parati adstarent, Sinceram ego in Domino fiduciam constituo; verè pœnitentiam ago; Christum mihi in Regem & Prophetam æque ac in Sacerdotem ascisco; Spiritum pro Sanctificatore meo accipio, & ut brevi absolvam, quicquid vis amplius; nec hæc dicentes magis urgeret scrupulus, quàm illos qui baptizando Infanti susceptores adhibiti, illius nomine (quod plerumq; ipse nesciunt) ministro roganti, Abrenuncias carnem, mundum, & Diabolum? respondent, hæc omnia abrenuncio. Qualis quidem professio, cum nulli nisi verè renato homini competere possit, necesse est ut gravis admodum & vix ferenda impositio talis, quibusdam videretur, si omnibus in Parochiis suis degentibus, hujusmodi interrogationes proposituri essent, quibus pro certo scirent, se nihil aliud, quam ad aperta mendacia in medium proferenda, viam illis stratueros, & solennem Religionis istum actum in inane formalitatis ludibrium versuros iri, se apprehenderent. Præterea si aliqui forsitan è membrorum numero ob professionis istius defectum, excludendi comperirentur, maximè pii hi forent, quibus tenera esset conscientia, & singularis cordis integritas, qui non ausi sint tali aliquid de se profiteri, quod excusso pœnitens pectore, pro comperto factis habeant necne, animi penderent. Hæc seriò perpendenti, ne mirum sit tibi candide Lector, si externi visibilis membri definitionem à Religionis Christianæ ejus amplexu solo, quem instituta divina publicè attendendo, quodammodò ut oculis cernatur palam facit, quàm à regenerationis professione, desumere maluero.

Confitendum mihi est rem meam, in hoc, agi maximam
propter opinionem, & libros quos de cænæ Domini, ante
hæc in lucem emisi. Ecclesiæ sane & Fœderis externum
statum sive Relationem, generali nostræ ad Sacramenta ad-
missioni, è parte nostra omnes (in quantum scio) subtrahimus
præsidium & fundamentum; Jam verò si verbo Dei, au-
ratione aliqua indubitata firmatum sit, neminem Ecclesiæ
membrum, sive Dei fœderatum, esse posse, nisi qui ab Ecclesiâ
tanquam vere renatâ fide & resipiscentiâ (ob ejus talem pro-
fessionem) jamjam præditus esse supponatur; Liceat mihi
ingenue & liberè ut honestum & integrum plane decet vi-
rum, palam edisserere, necesse esse unicuique nostrum, à sen-
tentiâ istâ perpulchrâ licet; & pergratâ quâ Sacramenta
Ecclesiæ ex instituto Dei, conversionis media esse statu-
mus & propugnâvimus, pedibus recedere; Et in locum
ejus, hoc tantum, scilicet, media quidè conversionis esse,
sed ex accidenti tantum, non ex primâ ordinantis Dei, vel
ipsius administrantis Ecclesiæ, intentione, substituere opor-
tet; quamvis naturâ suâ adeò apprimè comparata, sit
apta nata sint ad consequendum talem effectum, immo &
secundum divinum ipsum decretum de eventu, non raro
etiam istum consequantur.

Video quidè Ecclesiarum Protestantium, & (quod plu-
ris facimus) nostræ etiam, *vultum* in hac re (si ad Jahakobi
verba alludam) *quod ecce non est erga nos*, dum vere peni-
tentes & fideles ad Sacro Sanctum hoc Domini institutum
adhortans, cæteros alios ferio cavere sibi jubendo, quo-
dammodo abstertere, & amandare prorsus videtur; Ac
proinde omnibus author sum, ut in majorem hujusce rei
controversæ cautelam, & conscientiæ, & meæ & suæ ipso-
rum securitatem, Ecclesiæ nostræ Liturgiam revolvant &
tanquam fide digniorem (nisi aliter sibi veritas affulgeat)
præ meis qualibuscunque scriptis omnibus, sibi habeant. &

amplexentur. Animam quidem libero meam; Interim cogitationes hasce largiores quasdam meas, quæ contra communem opinionum aliorum torrentem promovere nihil forsan valebunt, mihi reservo; Hoc unicum tamen in genere, Cordatiorum & prudentiorum judicio discutiendum humilimè proponens, Annon vulgò recepta Protestantium sententia, tam arctum visibilis Ecclesiæ fundamentum jacentium, quale est, nullius nisi verè regeneratæ fidei professio, sænetram ad congregandas (sive potius segregandas) Ecclesias adeò latam aperuerit, ut nisi huic malo, ejusmodi excogitato remedio sit occursum, major erit inflicti vulneris hiatus, quam ut ullo alio adhibito medicamine valeat coalescere; Immo ut si quis vel maximo percitus desiderio hoc satageret, jurandum illi esset, *in illo die dicendo, non essem obligaturus, etiam domi meæ non est panis neque vestis, ut ruina ista sub manu mea sit.*

Quantum ad alteram præsentis instituti partem attinet. Deplorandum sane est nobis. adeo minutulas in Opinione differentias, tantam inter Ecclesiæ ejusdem filios, ac Religionis ejusdem professores, animorum facere disjunctionē, & affectus Christiani divortium. Miseret me nostræ Ecclesiæ, si honoris & dignitatis inter Ecclesiasticos accumulatio, ut olim inter *Abraham & Lothum* fortunarum accretio, fratres disjungeret; *Profectus est Lot orientem versus, & separaverunt se alterum ab altero.* Magnam quidem antiquitati venerationem deberi, in confessio est; Et qui in veterum scriptis vel obiter versantur Episcopatum Apostolorū vestigia propemodum prensare minime dubitant, veruntamen ut omnia non revoluta & immota manentia, successu temporis situm contrahunt: Ita accidit Ecclesiæ, ut inter Episcopatum primitivum, & qui mundum jam invasit modernum, differentiam certe aliquantulam vel cæcus aspiciat. Quæ differentia si ratione formalitatis cujusdam veluti in negotio

negotio electionis (quæ qualis fuit primitiva, ex *Epistolis Cypriani* apparet) solummodo esset, non adeo magni momenti (licet observanda tamen) res foret: Sed quum in precipuo ipsius Regiminis Ecclesiastici fine, qui sanctitatis scilicet publicæ & animarum salutis (non externæ solum concordia) promotione consistit, sita est: & finis iste procul dubio sine Presbyterorum cooperatione & mutuo auxilio, tam in *ducendo* quam *docendo* gregem, adeo sceleriter obtineri nequeat, res quidem non parvi sed maximi ponderis hic agitur, qui sicco pede, immo ficcis oculis, haud sane prætereunda est. *Quam bonum & amœnum* (si verbis loquar Psalmistæ) videtur, si ad portandum onus grave plures admoveantur humeri, & ad opus, grande peragendum, plures adhibeantur manus, & ita scilicet *habitarent fratres etiam una*. Si *Mosi* concilium *Jethronis* adeo arrisit (juxta Hieronimum) quantum quæso Episcopo incumbit, ut Presbyteris aurem faciliem præberet vel hoc potissimum nomine, quo seipsum onere levaret, & de ratione dispensationis suæ aliquid diminuire, in magnum futurum diem satageret. *Equitas vestra innotescat omnibus hominibus, Dominus propeest.*

Non est quidem privati cujusq; unionis publicæ terminos cudere, quæ unanimi consensu & mutua ope eorum qui ad opus istud à summis potestatibus designati fuerint, transigenda est. Si nihil aliud nisi Declaratio Regia extaret, pacem quadantenus conciliandi via & methodus nobis præmonstraretur, modò illorum qui eam confecturi essent, voluntas ipsa, non deficeret. Quantum ad meipsum attinet, libere ego & apertè protestor, Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ felicitatem in eo, prout mihi persuasum habeo, consistere, si Episcopi ad moderatiorem aliarum partium, de iis, quæ justa sunt, sententiam utcunq; potius descendant, quam si omnes in omnibus ad illorum mores & præscripta se componere manibus pedibusque festinarent. Immodò etiam ut
pleniùs

plenius loquar, quamvis *Toleratio* (verbo isto strictius sumpto) magis sobriis, pacem publicam excolentibus, & nulli incommodantibus, ad conscientiae suae fruitionem concessa, res foret piis & probis pergrata, quae maximas ex animo gratias Deo iis eliceret: Tantillum tamen, quo Christiani, eadem lege & omine, inter Turcas, & inter Papicolas Protestantes frui possunt & fruuntur, beneficium homini acceptum referre, jejunum certè & sterile, benignitatis inops quidem, immo & vile pronuncio, præ eo, quod nos expetivimus, & in nomine Domini adhuc postulamus, iustum nempe & æquam inter utriusque partis fratres, vel saltem Episcopum inter, & Presbyteros ejus juxta Ecclesiae Primitivæ exemplar, ex compositione factam concordiam; quæ sola omnibus iis quæ ad gloriam Regni Christi in *Anglia* spectant, respondebit. *Ecqua re pretium est in manibus Sapientum ad possidendam Pacem, at deest animus illis?*

Utut vero res evaserit, nos semper sub manu, oculis, & potestate Dei gratiosissimi sumus, qui pacis Author est & conservator Concordiæ; & in super sub Regis clementissimi imperio, qui Propositiones ad Pacem & Unionem inter suos subditos Christianos reducendam & conservandam Publice produxisse haud dedignatus est, quasque propterea ex animo suo protectas esse, Religio est, nobis exultimare. Si verò ille postquam omnia expertus est, concordiam hanc, per mutram scilicet inter Presbyterum & Episcopum compositionem, tentatam, re infectâ dimittere cogatur; ne utinam spero hoc faciet, nisi in clementissimis saltem illis verbis *Achischi* ad *Davidem*. *Ut vivit Jehova tu recta es, & bonum videtur in oculis meis egredi te & ingredi te mecum in castra, quia non deprehendi in te malum; ex quo die venisti ad me in diem hunc, sed in oculis istorum satraparum bona adhuc non videris.*

J. H.

The first of these is the fact that the
 second of these is the fact that the
 third of these is the fact that the
 fourth of these is the fact that the
 fifth of these is the fact that the
 sixth of these is the fact that the
 seventh of these is the fact that the
 eighth of these is the fact that the
 ninth of these is the fact that the
 tenth of these is the fact that the
 eleventh of these is the fact that the
 twelfth of these is the fact that the
 thirteenth of these is the fact that the
 fourteenth of these is the fact that the
 fifteenth of these is the fact that the
 sixteenth of these is the fact that the
 seventeenth of these is the fact that the
 eighteenth of these is the fact that the
 nineteenth of these is the fact that the
 twentieth of these is the fact that the
 twenty-first of these is the fact that the
 twenty-second of these is the fact that the
 twenty-third of these is the fact that the
 twenty-fourth of these is the fact that the
 twenty-fifth of these is the fact that the
 twenty-sixth of these is the fact that the
 twenty-seventh of these is the fact that the
 twenty-eighth of these is the fact that the
 twenty-ninth of these is the fact that the
 thirtieth of these is the fact that the
 thirty-first of these is the fact that the
 thirty-second of these is the fact that the
 thirty-third of these is the fact that the
 thirty-fourth of these is the fact that the
 thirty-fifth of these is the fact that the
 thirty-sixth of these is the fact that the
 thirty-seventh of these is the fact that the
 thirty-eighth of these is the fact that the
 thirty-ninth of these is the fact that the
 fortieth of these is the fact that the
 forty-first of these is the fact that the
 forty-second of these is the fact that the
 forty-third of these is the fact that the
 forty-fourth of these is the fact that the
 forty-fifth of these is the fact that the
 forty-sixth of these is the fact that the
 forty-seventh of these is the fact that the
 forty-eighth of these is the fact that the
 forty-ninth of these is the fact that the
 fiftieth of these is the fact that the
 fifty-first of these is the fact that the
 fifty-second of these is the fact that the
 fifty-third of these is the fact that the
 fifty-fourth of these is the fact that the
 fifty-fifth of these is the fact that the
 fifty-sixth of these is the fact that the
 fifty-seventh of these is the fact that the
 fifty-eighth of these is the fact that the
 fifty-ninth of these is the fact that the
 sixtieth of these is the fact that the
 sixty-first of these is the fact that the
 sixty-second of these is the fact that the
 sixty-third of these is the fact that the
 sixty-fourth of these is the fact that the
 sixty-fifth of these is the fact that the
 sixty-sixth of these is the fact that the
 sixty-seventh of these is the fact that the
 sixty-eighth of these is the fact that the
 sixty-ninth of these is the fact that the
 seventieth of these is the fact that the
 seventy-first of these is the fact that the
 seventy-second of these is the fact that the
 seventy-third of these is the fact that the
 seventy-fourth of these is the fact that the
 seventy-fifth of these is the fact that the
 seventy-sixth of these is the fact that the
 seventy-seventh of these is the fact that the
 seventy-eighth of these is the fact that the
 seventy-ninth of these is the fact that the
 eightieth of these is the fact that the
 eighty-first of these is the fact that the
 eighty-second of these is the fact that the
 eighty-third of these is the fact that the
 eighty-fourth of these is the fact that the
 eighty-fifth of these is the fact that the
 eighty-sixth of these is the fact that the
 eighty-seventh of these is the fact that the
 eighty-eighth of these is the fact that the
 eighty-ninth of these is the fact that the
 ninetieth of these is the fact that the
 ninety-first of these is the fact that the
 ninety-second of these is the fact that the
 ninety-third of these is the fact that the
 ninety-fourth of these is the fact that the
 ninety-fifth of these is the fact that the
 ninety-sixth of these is the fact that the
 ninety-seventh of these is the fact that the
 ninety-eighth of these is the fact that the
 ninety-ninth of these is the fact that the
 hundredth of these is the fact that the